

PCF AND ABELIAN GROUPS

SAHARON SHELAH

ABSTRACT. We deal with some pcf, (possible cofinality theory) investigations mostly motivated by questions in abelian group theory. We concentrate on applications to test problems but we expect the combinatorics will have reasonably wide applications. We almost always answer the original test problem which is proving the existence of $\aleph_\omega$ -free abelian groups with trivial dual, i.e., with no non-trivial homomorphisms to the integers. We solve it assuming CH; combinatorially, we prove that “almost always” there are $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \lambda$ which are quite free and have a relevant black box. The qualification “almost always” means that except when we have strong restrictions on cardinal arithmetic, in fact those restrictions are “everywhere”. The nicest combinatorial result is probably the so called “Black Box Trichotomy Theorem” proved in ZFC. Also we may replace abelian groups by R -modules, part of our motivation is that in some sense our advantage over earlier results becomes clearer in such context.

Date: May 17, 2010.

Key words and phrases. cardinal arithmetic, pcf, black box, negative partition relations, trivial dual conjecture, trivial endomorphism conjecture.

Research supported by German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research and Development. Publication 898.

ANNOTATED CONTENT

- §0 Introduction, pp. 3-8
 [We formulate the trivial dual conjecture for μ , TDU_μ , and relate it to pcf statements and black box principles. Similarly we state the trivial endomorphism conjecture for μ , TED_μ , but postpone its treatment.]
- §1 Preliminaries, pp. 9-18
 [We quote some definitions and results we shall use and state a major conclusion of this work: the Black Box Trichotomy Theorem.]
- §2 Cases of weak G.C.H., pp. 19-27
 [Assume $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$, $\mu < \lambda < 2^\mu < 2^\lambda$ with λ minimal under those conditions. Then for any $\theta < \mu$, a black box called $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ holds which for our purpose is very satisfactory.]
- §3 Getting large μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$, pp. 28-40
 [The point is that to give the sufficient conditions for BB: see 2.10(2). Let $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\lambda = 2^\mu$. We give sufficient conditions for the existence of μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality λ , which is quite helpful for our purposes implying the existence of suitable black boxes. One such condition is (see 3.6): the existence of $\sigma < \kappa$ and $\chi < \lambda$ such that $\chi^\sigma = \lambda$. Recall that by §2 assuming $\lambda < \lambda^{<\lambda}$ suffice (for the black box). Now assuming there is none as above and $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ we have $(D\ell)_{S_{<\kappa}^\lambda}^*$, hence $(D\ell)_S$ for every stationary $S \subseteq S_{<\kappa}^\lambda$.
 In 3.1 we consider $\sigma \in (\kappa, \mu) \cap \text{Reg}$ and $\chi \in (\mu, \lambda)$ such that $\chi^{<\sigma>\text{tr}} = \lambda$. Here the results are less sharp. Also if $\lambda = \chi^+$, where χ is regular, then this holds; see 3.12. We end by indicating some obvious connections.]
- §4 Propagating $\text{OBB}_\sigma(\bar{C})$ down by pcf, pp. 41-52
 [We use assumptions on pp to deduce results on the so-called OBB, ordered black boxes, so we deduce that it occurs very often.]
- §5 On the μ -free trivial dual conjecture for R -modules, pp. 53-63
 [We deduce what we can on the conjecture TDU_μ .]

0. INTRODUCTION

We prove some black boxes, most notably the Black Box Trichotomy Theorem. Our original question is whether provably in ZFC the conjecture $\text{TUD}_{\aleph_\omega}$ holds and even $\text{TED}_{\aleph_\omega}$ where:

Definition 0.1. 1) Let TUD_μ , the trivial dual conjecture for μ mean: there is a μ -free abelian group G such that G has a trivial dual (i.e., $\text{Hom}(G, \mathbb{Z}) = \{0\}$).
 2) Let TED_μ , the trivial endomorphism conjecture for μ mean: there is a μ -free abelian group with no non-trivial endomorphism, i.e., $\text{End}(G)$ is trivial (i.e., $\text{End}(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}$).

Much is known for $\mu = \aleph_1$ (see , e.g., [4]). Note that each of the cases of 0.1 implies that G is μ -free, not free, and much is known on the existence of μ -free, non-free abelian groups of cardinality μ (see , e.g., [3]). Also positive answers are known if , e.g., $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{L}$, see pg.461 of [4].

Note that by singular compactness, for singular μ there are no counterexamples of cardinality μ .

By [28], if $\mu = \aleph_n$, then the answer to TUD_μ is yes, for the cardinality $\lambda = \beth_n$. It was hoped that the method would apply to many other related problems and to some extent this has been vindicated by Göbel-Shelah [5]; on $\text{TED}_\mu, \mu = \aleph_n$ see Göbel-Herden-Shelah [?]. But we do not know the answer for $\mu = \aleph_\omega$. Note that even if we succeed this will not cover the results of [28], [5], [?]; e.g. hence the cardinal is $< \beth_\omega$ and probably when we deal with larger cardinals.

A natural approach is to prove in ZFC appropriate set-theoretic principles, and this is the method we try here. This raised combinatorial questions which seem interesting in their own right; our main result in this direction is the Black Box Trichotomy Theorem 1.22. But the original question has bothered me and the results are irritating: it is “very hard” not to answer yes in the following sense (later we say more on the set theory):

- (a) failure implies strong demands on cardinal arithmetic in many $\beth_\delta$, (e.g. if $\text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_1$ then $\beth_{\delta+1} = \text{cf}(\beth_{\delta+1}) = (\beth_{\delta+1})^{<\beth_{\delta+1}}$ and $\chi < \beth_{\delta+1} \Rightarrow \chi^{\aleph_0} < \beth_{\delta+1}$ - see details below)
- (b) if we weaken “ $\aleph_\omega$ -freeness” to (so called “stability” or “softness” and even) “ $\aleph_\omega$ -free or constructible from a ladder system $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \subseteq S_{\aleph_0}^\lambda \rangle$ ”, then we can prove existence.
- (c) Replacing abelian groups by R -modules, the parallel question depends on a set of regular cardinals, $\text{sp}(R)$ - see Definition 5.2 so the case of abelian groups is $R = \mathbb{Z}$. If $\text{sp}(R)$ is empty, there is nothing to be done. By [26], if $\text{sp}(R)$ is unbounded below some strong limit singular cardinal $\mu = \aleph_{\alpha+\omega}$, then TUD_{μ^+} - see 5.16. By [27], if $\text{sp}(R)$ is infinite, say $\kappa_n < \kappa_{n+1} \in \text{sp}(R)$ then see 5.16 again, (by the quotation 1.18). Furthermore: see 3.17, we prove if $\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2 \in \text{sp}(R)$ then the answer for R -modules is positive
- (d) if CH holds then $\text{TUD}_{\aleph_\omega}$, by 5.13
- (e) even if the negation of $\text{TUD}_{\aleph_\omega}$ is consistent with ZFC its consistency strength is large, to some extent this follows by clause (a) above but by §2 we have more xxx

Obviously, e.g. clause (c) seems helpful for abelian groups; now at first sight is seen helpful that for every n there is an $\aleph_n$ -free non-free abelian group of cardinality $\aleph_n$, but this is not enough. More specifically presently this method does not resolve the problem because for $R = \mathbb{Z}$ we know only that $\text{sp}(R)$ includes $\{\aleph_0, \aleph_1\}$ (but under MA there is no other one $< 2^{\aleph_0}$).

Still we get some information: a reasonably striking set-theoretic result is the Black Box Trichotomy Theorem 1.22 below; some abelian group theory consequences are given in §5.

A sufficient condition for a positive answer to TDU_μ is (see 5.11):

$$\textcircled{*}_0 \text{ TDU}_\mu \text{ if } \text{BB}(\lambda, \mu, \theta, J) \text{ when } J \text{ is } J_\omega^{\text{bd}} \text{ or } J_{\omega_1 \times \omega}^{\text{bd}} \text{ and } \theta = \beth_4.$$

The definition of the assertion $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu, \theta, J)$ is as follows, (BB stands for black box):

Definition 0.2. Assume we are given a quadruple $(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \kappa)$ of cardinals [but we may replace λ by an ideal I on $S \subseteq \lambda = \sup(S)$ so writing λ means $S = \lambda$ and/or replace κ by an ideal J on κ and κ means J_κ^{bd}]. Let $\text{BB}^-(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \kappa)$ mean that some pair $(\bar{C}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$ satisfies the clauses (A) and (B) below; we call the pair $(\bar{C}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$ a witness for $\text{BB}^-(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \kappa)$. Let $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \kappa)$ mean that for some witness $(\bar{C}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$ satisfies clause (A) below and for some sequence $\langle S_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ of pairwise disjoint subsets of λ (or of S), each $(\bar{C} \upharpoonright S_i, \bar{\mathbf{c}} \upharpoonright S_i)$ satisfies clause (B) below, (so replacing $S, \mathbf{c}$ by $S_i, \mathbf{c} \upharpoonright S_i$) where:

- (A) (a) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$ and $S = S(\bar{C}) \subseteq \lambda = \sup(S)$
- (b) $C_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$ has order type κ
- (c) $\bar{C}$ is μ -free which means:
 - if $u \in [S]^{<\mu}$, then for some $\bar{A} = \langle A_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle$ the sets $\langle C_\alpha \setminus A_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint and A_α is a bounded subset of C_α (so presently $\in [C_\alpha]^{<\kappa}$)
 - [but when we replace κ by J then we replace “ $A_\alpha \in [C_\alpha]^{<\kappa}$ ” by $A'_\alpha := \{\text{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \gamma) : \gamma \in A_\alpha\} \in J$ if J is an ideal, $A'_\alpha \in J \Leftrightarrow \emptyset \in J$ otherwise (e.g., a filter on κ)]
- (B) (d) $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \langle \mathbf{c}_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$
- (e) $\mathbf{c}_\alpha$ is a function from C_α to θ
- (f) if $\mathbf{c} : \bigcup_{\alpha \in S} C_\alpha \rightarrow \theta$, then $\mathbf{c}_\alpha = \mathbf{c} \upharpoonright C_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in S$
 - [but when we replace λ by I , then we demand this for every $\alpha \in S'$ for some $S' \in I^+$ (i.e., $S' \subseteq S, S' \notin I$).

Remark 0.3. The reader may recall that if S is a stationary subset of $\{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$ for a regular cardinal λ and S is non-reflecting and $\bar{C} = \langle C_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$ satisfies $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$, $\text{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$, then $\diamond_S$ implies $\text{BB}(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda, \kappa)$. So if $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{L}$ then for every regular $\kappa < \lambda$, λ non-weakly compact we have $\text{BB}(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda, \kappa)$.

So the consistency of (more than) having many cases BB is known, but we like to get results in ZFC.

Variants are

Definition 0.4. In Definition 0.2.

- 1) We may replace θ by (χ, θ) which means there are $S, \bar{C}$ satisfying clause (A) of Definition 0.2 and

(B)' if $\bar{\mathbf{F}} = \langle \mathbf{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$ and $\mathbf{F}_\alpha$ is a function from ${}^\chi(C_\alpha)$ to θ , then for some $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$ we have:

(d) $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \langle \mathbf{c}_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$

(e) $\mathbf{c}_\alpha < \theta$

(f) if $\mathbf{c} : \lambda \rightarrow \chi$, then $\mathbf{c}_\alpha = \mathbf{F}_\alpha(\mathbf{c} \upharpoonright C_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in S$ [or if we replace λ by I the set $\{\alpha \in S : \mathbf{c}_\alpha = \mathbf{F}_\alpha(\mathbf{c} \upharpoonright C_\alpha)\}$ does not belong to the ideal I].

2) Replacing (χ, θ) by, abusing notation, $(\chi, 1/\theta)$, mean that in clause (f) we replace “ $\mathbf{c}_\alpha = \mathbf{F}_\alpha(\mathbf{c} \upharpoonright C_\alpha)$ ” by “ $\mathbf{c}_\alpha \neq \mathbf{F}_\alpha(\mathbf{c} \upharpoonright C_\alpha)$ ”.

3) We may replace μ by $\bar{C}$ so waiving the freeness demand, i.e. $\bar{C}$ is not necessarily μ -free. Alternatively, we may replace μ by a set $\mathcal{F}$ of one-to-one functions from κ to λ equivalently when $\bar{C}$ lists $\{\text{Rang}(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

4) Replacing κ by $*$ means that in (A)(b) we required just $C_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$ (and not necessarily $\text{otp}(C_\alpha) = \kappa$).

5) We may replace θ by “ $< \theta_1$ ” meaning “for every $\theta < \theta_1$ ”.

Remark 0.5. Note the $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \kappa)$ is somewhat related to $\text{NTP}(\lambda, \kappa)$ from [21, Ch.II], i.e. $\text{BB}(\lambda, \lambda, \theta, \kappa) \Rightarrow \text{NPT}(\lambda, \kappa)$, but NPT has no “predictive” part.

In this work we shall show that it is “hard” for $\mathbf{V}$ not to give a positive answer (i.e. existence) for 0.1 via a case of 0.2 or variants; we review below the “evidence” for this claim. By 5.11(1) we know that (really $2^{2^{\aleph_1}}$ can be weakened):

$\odot_0$ a sufficient condition for TDU_μ is, e.g., $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu, 2^{(2^{\aleph_1})^+}, J)$, where J is J_ω^{bd} or $J_{\omega_1 \times \omega}^{\text{bd}}$ (so κ is $\aleph_0$ or $\aleph_1$).

Recall that $\mathbf{C}_\kappa$ is the class of strong limit singular cardinals of cofinality κ when $\kappa > \aleph_0$ and “most” of them when $\kappa = \aleph_0$ (see Definition 1.1 and Claim 1.2).

Now the first piece of the evidence given here is that a failure of G.C.H. near $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ helps is the following fact:

$\otimes_1$ $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ if $\theta < \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\mu < \lambda < 2^\mu < 2^\lambda$.

[Why? By Conclusion 2.7(1); it is a consequence of the Black Box Trichotomy Theorem 1.22.]

Note: another formulation is

$\square_1$ if $\theta < \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ but $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ fail and $\lambda := 2^\mu$ then $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$.

[Why? Let $\lambda_1 = \min\{\chi : 2^\chi > 2^\mu\}$, so necessarily $\mu < \lambda_1$; if $\lambda_1 < 2^\mu$ then $\text{BB}(\lambda_1, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ holds by $\otimes_1$, so by our assumption $\lambda_1 = 2^\mu$, so $\mu \leq \chi < 2^\mu \Rightarrow 2^\chi = 2^\mu \Rightarrow (2^\mu)^\chi = 2^{\mu^\chi} \equiv 2^\chi = 2^\mu$, but this means $(2^\mu)^{<2^\mu} = 2^\mu$, as stated.]

So by $\odot_0 + \square_1$

$\odot_1$ if $\text{TDU}_{\aleph_\omega}$ fails, then

(a) a large class of cardinals satisfies a weak form of G.C.H.

(b) more specifically, $(\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0} \cup \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_1}) \wedge \lambda = 2^\mu \Rightarrow \lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$.

Also

$\otimes_2$ $\text{BB}(2^\mu, \kappa^{+\omega+1}, \theta, \kappa^+)$ if $\theta < \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $(\forall \chi)(\chi < 2^\mu \Rightarrow \chi^{<\kappa^+>_{\text{tr}}} < 2^\mu)$.

[Why? See 3.1 or 3.2 recalling 2.10, remembering that $\chi^{<\partial>_{\text{tr}}}$ is the ∂ -tree power of χ , i.e., the supremum of the number of ∂ -branches of a tree with $\leq \chi$ nodes and ∂ levels.]

So

- ⊙₂ if $\text{TDU}_{\aleph_\omega}$ fails, then for every $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$ there is χ such that $\mu < \chi < \chi^{<\aleph_1>\text{tr}} = 2^\mu$, hence $\mu < \chi < 2^\mu$ and without loss of generality $\text{cf}(\chi) = \aleph_1$, hence $\mu^{+\omega_1} \leq \chi < 2^\mu$, and so G.C.H. fails quite strongly (putting us in some sense in the opposite direction to ⊙₁).
- ⊗₃ if $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$, $\theta < \mu$, $\lambda = 2^\mu$ and some set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ is μ_1 -free of cardinality $2^\mu (= \mu^\kappa)$, then $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu_1, \theta, \kappa)$.

[Why? See 2.10.]

In §3 we shall give various sufficient conditions for the satisfaction of the hypotheses of ⊗₃. Another piece of evidence is

- ⊗₄ $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu_1, \theta, J)$ when:
 - (a) $\theta < \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\lambda = 2^\mu = \lambda^{<\lambda}$
 - (b) J is an ideal on $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa)$ extending J_κ^{bd} , and $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$, $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ are such that $\delta \in S \Rightarrow C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta) \wedge \kappa = \text{otp}(C_\delta)$
 - (c) $\bar{C}$ is μ_1 -free, $\mu_1 < \lambda$, see Definition 1.3(1A), (2)
 - (d) • $(\forall \alpha < \lambda)(\lambda > |\{C_\delta \cap \alpha : \delta \in S \wedge \alpha \in C_\delta\}|) \wedge (\forall \chi < \lambda)(\chi^{<\kappa>\text{tr}} < \lambda)$ or
 - $(\text{D}\ell)_S$ (see Definition 1.14).

[Why? This follows from [26].]

A consequence for the present is:

- ⊗₅ $\text{BB}(\lambda, \kappa^{+\omega}, \theta, J_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa}^{\text{bd}})$ when:
 - (a) $\theta < \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$, $\lambda = 2^\mu = \lambda^{<\lambda}$
 - (b) $S \subseteq S_{\aleph_1}^\lambda$, $\delta \in S \Rightarrow C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta) \wedge \text{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa^+$
 - (c) $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is $\kappa^{+\omega}$ -free
 - (d) $(\text{D}\ell)_S$ or the first possibility of ⊗₄(d).

[Why? By ⊗₄.]

The point of ⊗₅ is that we can find $\bar{C}$ as in clause (b) of ⊗₅ with $S \subseteq S_{\aleph_1}^\lambda$ “quite large” so we ignore the difference (in the introduction) - see 2.13. In particular

- ₂ if $\lambda = \mu^+ = 2^\mu$ and $\mu > \aleph_0$ is a strong limit cardinal of cofinality $\kappa = \aleph_0$, then for some $\bar{C}$, S clauses (a)-(d) of ⊗₅ hold.

Moreover

- ₃ if $\kappa < \chi$, κ is a regular cardinal, $\lambda = \chi^+ = 2^\chi$ and $\kappa \neq \text{cf}(\chi)$, then $\diamond_S$ for every “not too small” $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda = \{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$.

[Why? By [30] - see 2.9.]

We can conclude

- ⊙₃ if $\text{TDU}_{\aleph_\omega}$ fails and $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$, then 2^μ is not μ^+ , moreover, is not of the form χ^+ , $\text{cf}(\chi) \neq \aleph_1$
- ⊗₆ $\text{BB}(2^\mu, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ if $\theta < \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\chi^\sigma = 2^\mu$ for some $\sigma < \kappa$, $\chi < 2^\mu$.

[Why? The assumptions (a)+(f) of claim 3.6 holds for $J = J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$ and σ here standing for θ there. E.g. clause (e) there, “ $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\theta < \mu$ ” holds as μ is strong limit. So the first assumption of conclusion 3.8 hold, and the second ($\mu^\kappa = 2^\mu$, $\mu^+ \leq 2^\mu$) holds as $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\chi$. So the conclusion of 3.8 holds which by 2.10 implies that ⊗₆ holds.]

- ⊗₇ $\text{BB}(2^\mu, \partial, \theta, \kappa)$ if $\theta < \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\partial = \sup\{\text{cf}(\chi) : \text{cf}(\chi) < \mu < \chi < 2^\mu \text{ and } \text{pp}_{\text{cf}(\chi)\text{-comp}}(\chi) = {}^+ 2^\mu\}$.

[Why? By 3.1.]

So (by $\odot_0, \otimes_6, \otimes_7$)

- $\odot_4$ if $\text{TDU}_{\aleph_\omega}$ fails, then for every $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_1}$ we have
 - (a) $\alpha < 2^\mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\aleph_0} < 2^\mu$
 - (b) for some $n, \chi < 2^\mu \wedge \aleph_n \leq \text{cf}(\chi) < \mu \Rightarrow \text{pp}_{\text{cf}(\chi)\text{-comp}}(\chi) \neq^+ 2^\lambda$.

By the end of §3

- $\odot_5$ if $\text{TDU}_{\aleph_\omega}$ fails and $n \geq 3$, then
 - (A) no $\aleph_n$ -free (abelian) group G of cardinality $\aleph_n$ is Whitehead
 - (B) if $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0} \cup \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_1}$ and $\lambda = 2^\mu$ then $(D\ell)_{S_{\aleph_n}^\lambda}$.

Generally in [21] we suggest cardinal arithmetic assumptions as good “semi-axioms”.

We have used cases of WGCH (the Weak Generalized Continuum Hypothesis, i.e., $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+}$ for every λ) in [13], [14], [17], also in [18] and see [29], [10]. Influenced also by this, Baldwin suggested adopting WGCH giving arguments parallel to the ones for large cardinals (but with no problem of consistency). So it seems reasonable to see what we can say in our context (see proof 5).

Note that above we get:

Claim 0.6. Assume $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ hence is a strong limit singular cardinal of cofinality κ .

- 1) If $\mu^+ < 2^\mu < 2^{\mu^+}$ and $\kappa \in \{\aleph_0, \aleph_1\}$, then there is a μ^+ -free abelian group of cardinality μ^+ with $\text{Hom}(G, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$; note that this is iterable, i.e., if $\mu_{\ell+1} \in \mathbf{C}_{\mu_\ell^+}$ for $\ell < n$, $2^{\mu_\ell} > \mu_\ell^+$ for $\ell < n$ and μ_0 is like μ above, then the conclusion applies for μ_n .
- 2) If $\mu^+ = 2^\mu$ and $\kappa \in \{\aleph_0, \aleph_1\}$, then there is an $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ -free abelian group of cardinality μ^+ such that $\text{Hom}(G, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$.

Note that we can prove $\text{TDU}_{\aleph_{\omega+1}}$ if we answer positively to

Conjecture 0.7. If $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} > \kappa^+$ and $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa)$ and $\lambda \neq \aleph_1$ (or $\lambda \geq \beth_\omega$) then $(D\ell)_{S_\kappa^\lambda}$.

This work is continued in [30] and Göbel-Herden-Shelah ([?]).

We thank the referee for doing much more than duty dictates for pointing out much needed corrections and clarifications.

* * *

Notation 0.8. 1) Usually $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ with $S = S(\bar{C})$.

2) $\bar{C}$ is a λ -ladder system when S is a stationary subset of λ and $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$ for $\delta \in S$.

3) $\bar{C}$ is a strict λ -ladder system when in addition $\text{otp}(C_\delta) = \text{cf}(\delta)$.

4) $\bar{C}$ is a strict (λ, κ) -ladder system when in addition $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ where

5) $S_\kappa^\lambda := \{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$.

1. PRELIMINARIES

Most of our results involve $\mu \in \mathbf{C}$ where

- Definition 1.1.** Let $\mathbf{C} = \{\mu : \mu \text{ is a strong limit singular cardinal and } \text{pp}(\mu) = {}^+ 2^\mu\}$.
 2) $\mathbf{C}_\kappa = \{\mu \in \mathbf{C} : \text{cf}(\mu) = \kappa\}$.

Recall

Claim 1.2.

- (a) $\mu \in \mathbf{C}$ and moreover, $\text{pp}_{J_{\text{cf}(\mu)}^{\text{bd}}}(\mu) = {}^+ 2^\mu$ when μ is a strong limit singular cardinal of uncountable cofinality
- (b) if $\mu = \beth_\delta > \text{cf}(\mu)$ and $\delta = \omega_1$ or just $\text{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_0$, then $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\text{cf}(\mu)}$ and for a club of $\alpha < \delta$ we have $\beth_\alpha \in \mathbf{C}$
- (c) if $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\chi \in (\mu, 2^\mu)$ or just $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu$ and $\chi \in (\mu, \text{pp}_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}}^+(\mu))$ then there is a μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality χ , even $<_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}}$ -increasing μ^+ -free sequence of length χ , see Definition 1.3(4); moreover if $(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}})$ is χ^+ -directed and $\mathcal{F}_* \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ then we can demand $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_*$ (and there is such sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$).

Proof. Clause (a) holds by [21, ChII,§5], [21, ChVII,§1] and clause (b) by [21, ChIX,§5] and clause (c) holds by [9, ChII,2.3,pg.53]. $\square_{1.2}$

Definition 1.3. 1) The set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ is called (θ, σ, J) -free where J is an ideal on κ when $[f_1 \neq f_2 \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \{i : f_1(i) = f_2(i)\} \in J]$ and for every $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of cardinality $< \theta$ there is a sequence $\langle u_f : f \in \mathcal{F}' \rangle$ of members of J such that for every pair $(\gamma, i) \in \mu \times \kappa$ the set $\{f \in \mathcal{F}' : f(i) = \gamma \wedge i \notin u_f\}$ has cardinality $< 1 + \sigma$.

1A) We may replace “ $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ ” by $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, C_\delta$ a set of order type κ , or even $\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\}$; meaning that the definition applies to $\{f : \text{for some } \delta \in S, f \text{ is an increasing function from } \kappa \text{ onto } C_\delta\}$. Similarly for the other parts.

2) If $\sigma = 1$ we may omit it. If $J = J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$ we may omit it so we may say “ $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ is θ -free”. Lastly, “ $\mathcal{F}$ is free” means $\mathcal{F}$ is $|\mathcal{F}|^+$ -free.

3) If J is not an ideal on κ but is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, then we replace “ $u_f \in J$ ” by “ $(u_f \in J) \Leftrightarrow (\emptyset \in J)$ ” and $u_f \subseteq \kappa$, of course.

4) We say a sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ of members of ${}^\kappa \mu$ is (θ, J) -free when: $J \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ and for every $w \subseteq \alpha^*$ of cardinality $< \theta$ there is a sequence $\langle u_f : f \in \mathcal{F}' \rangle$ of subsets of κ such that: $(u_f \in J) \Leftrightarrow (\emptyset \in J)$ and $\alpha \in w \wedge \beta \in w \wedge \alpha < \beta \wedge i \in \kappa \setminus u_{f_\alpha} \wedge i \in \kappa \setminus u_{f_\beta} \Rightarrow f_\alpha(i) < f_\beta(i)$. Again if $J = J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$ then we may omit it.

5) We say $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ is normal when $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F} \wedge f_1(i_1) = f_2(i_2) \Rightarrow i_1 = i_2$. We say $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ is tree-like when it is a normal and moreover $f_1 \in \mathcal{F} \wedge f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_1 \wedge i < \kappa \wedge f_1(i) = f_2(i) \Rightarrow f_1 \upharpoonright i = f_2 \upharpoonright i$.

6) For $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ and ideal J on κ let (issp stand for instability spectrum)

$$\text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F}) = \{(\theta_1, \theta_2) : \kappa \leq \theta_1 < \theta_2 \text{ and for some } u \subseteq \mu \text{ of cardinality } \leq \theta_1 \text{ we have } \theta_2 \leq |\{\eta \in \mathcal{F} : \{i < \kappa : \eta(i) \in u\} \in J^+\}|\}.$$

7) Let $\theta \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$ means $(< \theta, \theta) \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$ where $(< \theta_1, \theta_2) \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$ means

that $(\theta'_1, \theta_2) \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$ for some $\theta'_1 < \theta_1$.

8) If we write $\text{issp}_J(\langle \eta_s : s \in I \rangle)$ we mean $\text{issp}_J(\{\eta_s : s \in I\})$ but demand $s_1 \neq s_2 \in I \Rightarrow \eta_{s_1} \neq \eta_{s_2}$.

Observation 1.4. 1) If J is a σ -complete ideal on κ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ and $\theta_0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2$, $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$ and $\text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0, \kappa^+, \sigma) < \text{cf}(\theta_2)$ (e.g. $\theta_1 < \theta_0^{+\omega}$, $\theta_1 < \text{cf}(\theta_2)$), then $(\theta_0, \theta_2) \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$.

2) If in addition $\mathcal{F}$ is tree-like and κ is regular, then $\text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0, \kappa^+, \kappa) < \text{cf}(\theta_2)$ suffices.

3) Assume J is an ideal on κ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ is (θ, σ, J) -free. If $\sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma)$ and $\kappa < \sigma$ then for every $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of cardinality $< \theta$ we can find $\langle u_f : f \in \mathcal{F}' \rangle$ as in Definition 1.3(1) and a partition $\bar{F}^i = \langle \mathcal{F}'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \leq |\mathcal{F}'| \rangle$ of $\mathcal{F}'$ such that $\langle \{f(i) : f \in \mathcal{F}'_\varepsilon, i < \kappa \text{ and } i \in \kappa \setminus u_f\} : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint subsets of μ . If we waive “ $\kappa < \sigma$ ” still for each $i < \kappa$ there is such $\bar{F}^i$ which is O.K. for this i .

4) If J is a κ -complete ideal on κ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ is (θ, κ^+, J) -free then $\mathcal{F}$ is (θ, J) -free.

Proof. 1) This should be clear as in [21, ChII, §6], but we give details.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ exemplify $\text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0, \kappa^+, \sigma)$, i.e. $\mathcal{P} \subseteq [\theta_1]^{<\theta_0}$ has cardinality $\text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0, \kappa^+, \sigma)$ and every $u \in [\theta_1]^{\leq \kappa}$ is included in the union of $< \sigma$ members of $\mathcal{P}$.

By the assumption “ $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$ ” there is $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mu$ which has cardinality $\leq \theta_1$ such that $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}'_{\mathcal{U}} := \{\eta \in \mathcal{F} : \{i < \kappa : \eta(i) \in \mathcal{U}\} \in J^+\}$ has cardinality $\geq \theta_2$.

Let g be a one to one function from $\mathcal{U}$ into θ_1 and fix for a while $\eta \in \mathcal{F}'$ let $v_\eta := \{g(\eta_n(i)) : i < \kappa \text{ and } \eta(i) \in \mathcal{U}\}$, clearly it is in $[\theta_1]^{\leq \kappa}$ hence there is $\mathcal{P}_\eta \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ of cardinality $< \sigma$ such that $v_\eta \subseteq \cup\{u : u \in \mathcal{P}_\eta\}$. So $\{\{i < \kappa : \eta(i) \in \mathcal{U} \text{ and } g(\eta(i)) \in u\} : u \in \mathcal{P}_\eta\}$ is a family of $< \sigma$ subsets of κ whose union belongs to J^+ . But J is a σ -complete ideal on κ hence there is

$$\circledast \quad u_\eta \in \mathcal{P}_\eta \text{ such that } \{i < \kappa : \eta(i) \in \mathcal{U} \text{ and } g(\eta(i)) \in u_\eta\} \in J^+.$$

So $\langle u_\eta : \eta \in \mathcal{F}' \rangle$ is well defined and $\eta \in \mathcal{F}' \Rightarrow u_\eta \in \mathcal{P}$ but $|\mathcal{P}| = \text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0, \kappa^+, \sigma) < \text{cf}(\theta_2)$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ was chosen such that $|\mathcal{F}'| \geq \theta_2$, hence for some $u_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ the family $\mathcal{F}'' := \{\eta \in \mathcal{F}' : u_\eta = u_2\}$ has cardinality $\geq \theta_2$. But then letting $u_1 = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{U} : g(\alpha) \in u_2\}$ we have $\mathcal{F}_* := \{\eta \in \mathcal{F} : \{i < \kappa : \eta(i) \in u_1\} \in J^+\} = \{\eta \in \mathcal{F} : \{i < \kappa : g(\eta(i)) \in u_2\} \in J^+\} \supseteq \mathcal{F}''$ hence the subfamily $\mathcal{F}_*$ of $\mathcal{F}$ has cardinality $\geq |\mathcal{F}''| \geq \theta_2$.

So u_1 exemplifies that $(\langle \theta_0, \theta_2 \rangle) \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$, the desired conclusion.

2) As without loss of generality $J = J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$ and this ideal is κ -complete.

3) Easy, too.

4) By part (3) and ??(1). □_{1.4}

Claim 1.5. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ and J an ideal on κ be such that $f_1 \neq f_2 \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : f_1(i) = f_2(i)\} \in J$.

1) $\mathcal{F}$ is θ^+ -free if J is θ -complete.

2) If $\kappa < \sigma < \lambda$ then: $\mathcal{F}$ is (λ, σ, J) -free iff there are no regular $\partial \in [\sigma, \lambda)$ and pairwise distinct $f_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ for $\alpha < \partial$ such that $S = \{\delta < \partial : \text{for some } \zeta \in [\delta, \partial) \text{ the set } \{i < \kappa : f_\zeta(i) \in \{f_\varepsilon(i) : \varepsilon < \delta\} \text{ belongs to } J^+\} \text{ is a stationary subset of } \partial\}$.

2A) In part (2), those two equivalence statements imply that for no $\theta \in [\sigma, \lambda)$, $\theta \in \text{issp}_J(\mathcal{F})$.

3) Assume we are given a sequence $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_* \rangle$ of members of ${}^\kappa \text{Ord}$, and $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \kappa$ and J is an ideal on κ . Then $\bar{f}$ is not (λ, λ) -free as a set iff there is an increasing sequence $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ of ordinals $< \alpha_*$ such that the set $S = \{\varepsilon < \lambda : \text{cf}(\varepsilon) \leq \kappa \text{ and } \{i < \kappa : (\exists \zeta < \varepsilon)(f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i) = f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i))\} \in J^+\}$ is a stationary subset of λ .

4) In part (4) if in addition $\bar{f}$ is tree-like, i.e., $f_\alpha(\varepsilon) = f_\beta(\varepsilon) \Rightarrow f_\alpha \upharpoonright \varepsilon = f_\beta \upharpoonright \varepsilon$ and $J_\kappa^{\text{bd}} \subseteq J$ then $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$.

Proof. 1) Easy and more. Proved inside the proof of 1.9 below.

2) Proved in proving $\boxplus$ inside the proof of 3.5.

3) By 1.4 check. ??

4),5) Like part (2), see more in 1.6. $\square_{??}$

Claim 1.6. Assume $\lambda > \mu \geq \kappa_2 \geq \kappa_1 = \kappa$.

1) $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\theta \text{Ord}$ is (κ_2, κ_1) -free iff $\mathcal{F}$ is (κ, κ) -free for every regular $\kappa \in [\kappa_1, \kappa_2]$.

2) There is a $(\kappa^{+\omega+1}, \kappa)$ -free set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega \mu$ of cardinality λ iff for every $n < \omega$ there is a $(\kappa^{+n}, \kappa^{+n})$ -free set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega \mu$ of cardinality λ .

3) Assume $\lambda > \mu \geq \kappa^{+\omega}$, $\mu > \sigma = \text{cf}(\mu)$ and $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\chi < \mu)$. If $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \subseteq {}^\sigma \mu$ has cardinality λ for $\varepsilon < \chi$, then we can find $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\sigma \mu$ of cardinality λ such that:

if $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$ and some $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ is (κ_2, κ_1) -free, then $\mathcal{F}$ is (κ_2, κ_1) -free.

Remark 1.7. See 1.5, 3.5.

Proof. 1) By 1.5(2).

2) By 3.10(1A).

3) Let $\langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ be increasing with limit μ , $\lambda_i = \lambda_i^\chi$ and let $\text{cd}_i : \mathcal{H}_{\leq \chi}(\lambda_i) \rightarrow \lambda_i$ is one-to-one onto; $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon = \{f_\alpha^\varepsilon : \alpha < \lambda\}$. Lastly, $f_\alpha \in {}^\sigma \mu$ is defined by $f_\alpha(i) = \text{cd}_i(\langle f_\alpha^\varepsilon \cap (\lambda_i \times \lambda_i) : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle)$. $\square_{1.6}$

Definition 1.8. 1) For $\mu \geq \kappa$ let $J_{\mu \times \kappa}^{\text{bd}}$ be the following ideal on $\mu \times \kappa$: for $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mu \times \kappa$, we have $\mathcal{U} \in J_{\mu \times \kappa}^{\text{bd}}$ iff for every large enough $\alpha < \mu$ for every large enough $i < \kappa$ the pair $(\alpha, i) \notin \mathcal{U}$.

2) For $\mu > \kappa$ we may identify $J_{\mu \times \kappa}^{\text{bd}}$ with $J_{\mu * \kappa}^{\text{bd}} := \{\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mu : (\forall^\infty \alpha < \mu)(\forall^\infty i < \kappa)(\kappa\alpha + i \notin \mathcal{U})\}$.

In particular

Claim 1.9. 1) Assume $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ is $(\theta, \kappa^{++}, J_\kappa^{\text{bd}})$ -free and $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) < \mu$. Then we can find $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq ({}^{\kappa^+ \times \kappa} \mu)$ of cardinality $|\mathcal{F}|$ such that $\mathcal{F}_1$ is $(\theta, J_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa}^{\text{bd}})$ -free.

2) If $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \mu > \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa)$ and there is a θ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality $\geq \lambda$ and $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ is stationary then there is a θ -free strict S -ladder system $\langle C_\delta : \delta = \mu\delta \in S \rangle$.

2A) In part (2) also for every $\sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma) \in (\kappa, \lambda)$ and stationary $S \subseteq S_\sigma^\lambda$ there is $(J_{\sigma * \theta}, \theta)$ -free strict S -ladder system $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$.

Proof. 1) If $\kappa^+ = \mu$ we shall construct $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq {}^{\kappa^+ \times \kappa}(\kappa^+ + \mu)$, but this is equivalent so we shall ignore this point. For $f \in \mathcal{F}$ let $g_f : \kappa^+ \times \kappa \rightarrow \mu$ be defined by:

(*) for $\zeta < \kappa^+, i < \kappa$ we let
 $g_f(\zeta, i) = \kappa^+ \cdot f(i) + \kappa \cdot \zeta + i$.

Let $\mathcal{G} = \{g_f : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$, now

(*) if $f_1 \neq f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ then $g_{f_1} \neq g_{f_2}$ and moreover $\{(\zeta, i) \in \kappa^+ \times \kappa : g_{f_1}(\zeta, i) = g_{f_2}(\zeta, i)\} \in J_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa}^{\text{bd}}$.

[Why? By Definition 1.3(1) we know $i(*) := \sup\{i < \kappa : f_1(i) = f_2(i)\} < \kappa$ and $\{(\zeta, i) : \zeta < \kappa^+ \text{ and } i < i(*)\} \in J_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa}^{\text{bd}}$, so we are done.]

(*)₂ assume $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ is of cardinality $< \theta$ and we shall find $\langle u_g^1 : g \in \mathcal{F}' \rangle$ is as required.

Why? We can choose $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of cardinality $< \theta$ such that $\mathcal{G}' = \{g_f : f \in \mathcal{F}'\}$. We can apply the assumption “ $\mathcal{F}$ is (θ, κ^{++}) -free and let $\langle u_f : f \in \mathcal{F}' \rangle$ be as in Definition 1.3(1); moreover let $\langle \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \rangle$ be as guaranteed in 1.4(3), so in particular $|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon| \leq \kappa^+$.

For each $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)$ let $\langle f_{\varepsilon, \iota} : \iota < |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon| \rangle$ list $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ with no repetitions and let $g_{\varepsilon, \iota} = g_{f_{\varepsilon, \iota}}$. First assume $|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon| \leq \kappa$, we let $u_{\varepsilon, j}^0 = \{i < \kappa : \langle f_{\varepsilon, \iota}(i) : \iota_1 \leq \iota \rangle \text{ is with some repetition or } i \in \cup\{u_{f_{\varepsilon, \iota_1}} : \iota_1 \leq \iota\}\}$. As J_κ^{bd} is κ -complete, clearly $u_{\varepsilon, j}^0 \in J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$ and let $u_{\varepsilon, j}^1 := \kappa^+ \times u_{\varepsilon, j}^0$.

Second, assume $|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon| = \kappa^+$ and for each $\zeta \in [\kappa, \kappa^+)$ let $\langle \xi(\zeta, j) : j < \kappa \rangle$ list ζ without repetition and for $j < \kappa, \zeta < \kappa^+$ let

$u_{\varepsilon, \zeta, j}^0 = \{i < \kappa : \langle f_{\varepsilon, \xi(\zeta, j_1)}(i) : j_1 \leq j \rangle \text{ is with some repetitions or } i \in \{u_{f_{\varepsilon, \xi(\zeta, j_1)}} : j_1 \leq j\}\}$

and for $\iota < |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon|$ let

$u_{\varepsilon, \iota}^1 = \{(\zeta, i) : \zeta \in (\iota, \kappa^+), i < \kappa \text{ and } i \in u_{\varepsilon, \zeta, j}^0 \text{ where } j \text{ is the unique } j < \kappa \text{ such that } \iota = \xi(\zeta, j)\}$.

Now that $\langle u_{g_{\varepsilon, \iota}}^1 : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \text{ and } \iota < |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon| \rangle$ is as required, i.e. witnessing the freeness of $\mathcal{F}'$.

2) Let $\langle f_\delta : \delta = \mu\delta \in S \rangle$ be a sequence of pairwise distinct members of $\mathcal{F}$ and for $\delta \in S$ let $\langle \alpha_{\delta, i} : i < \kappa \rangle$ be an increasing sequence of ordinals with limit δ .

Lastly, let $C_\delta = \{\mu\alpha_{\delta, i} + f_\delta(i) : i < \kappa\}$ for $\delta = \mu\delta \in S$.

2A) Similarly.

Easily (see [3] on the subject).

□_{1.9}

Claim 1.10. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega \mu$ or $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^{\omega_1 \times \omega} \mu$ is $(\theta, J_{\omega_1 \times \omega}^{\text{bd}})$ -free, then any abelian group derived from it is θ -free, see Definition 1.11 below.

Definition 1.11. 1) We say that G is an abelian group derived from $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega \mu$ when G is generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\} \cup \{y_{\eta, n} : \eta \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } n < \omega\}$ freely except a set of equations $\Gamma = \cup\{\Gamma_\eta : \eta \in \mathcal{F}\}$ where each Γ_η has the form $\{a_{\eta, n} y_{\eta, n+1} = y_{\eta, n} + x_{\eta(n), n} : n < \omega\}$ where:

$$a_{\eta, n} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}.$$

2) We say that G is an abelian group derived from $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^{\omega_1 \times \omega} \mu$ when G is generated by $\{x_{\alpha, \varepsilon, n} : \alpha < \mu \text{ and } \varepsilon < \omega_1, n < \omega\} \cup \{y_{\eta, \varepsilon, n} : \eta \in \mathcal{F}, \varepsilon < \omega_1, n < \omega\} \cup \{z_{\eta, n} : \eta \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } n < \omega\}$ freely except a set of equations $\Gamma = \cup\{\Gamma_\eta : \eta \in \mathcal{F}\}$ where each Γ_η has the form

$\{a_{\eta, \varepsilon, n} y_{\eta, \varepsilon, n+1} = y_{\eta, \varepsilon, n} + b_{\eta, \varepsilon, n} z_{\eta, \rho_{\eta, \varepsilon}(n)} + c_{\eta, \varepsilon, n} x_{\eta(\varepsilon, n), \varepsilon, n} : \varepsilon < \omega_1, n < \omega\}$ where

$a_{\eta, \varepsilon, n} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}, b_{\eta, \varepsilon, n} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, c_{\eta, \varepsilon, n} \in \mathbb{Z}, \rho_{\eta, \varepsilon} \in {}^\omega \omega$ and $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2 < \omega_1 \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(\rho_{\eta, \varepsilon_1}) \cap \text{Rang}(\rho_{\eta, \varepsilon_2})$ is finite.

Remark 1.12. Here choosing $\rho_{\eta, \varepsilon} \in {}^\omega (\omega + \varepsilon)$ is O.K. but not for §5.

Similarly to 1.9

Claim 1.13. 1) If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^{\text{Dom}(J)}\mu$ is (θ, σ_2^+, J) -free and J is a (σ_2, σ_1^+) -regular¹ and σ_1 -complete ideal then $\mathcal{F}$ is (θ, J) -free.

2) Assume I, J is an ideal on S, T respectively. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^S\mu$ is (θ, σ, I) -free, π is a function from T onto S and $\pi''(J) \supseteq I$ then $\mathcal{F} \circ \pi = \{f \circ \pi : f \in \mathcal{F}\} \subseteq {}^T\mu$ is (θ, σ, J) -free.

Definition 1.14. 1) Let $(D\ell)_S$ mean that:

- (a) $\lambda = \sup(S)$ is a regular uncountable cardinal
- (b) S is a stationary subset of λ
- (c) there is a witness $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$ which means:
 - (α) $\bar{\mathcal{P}} = \langle \mathcal{P}_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$
 - (β) $\mathcal{P}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$ has cardinality $< \lambda$
 - (γ) for every subset $\mathcal{U}$ of λ , the set $S_{\mathcal{U}} := \{\delta \in S : \mathcal{U} \cap \delta \in \mathcal{P}_\delta\}$ is a stationary subset of λ .

2) Let $(D\ell)_S^*$ be defined similarly by in (c)(γ) we demand $S \setminus S_{\mathcal{U}}$ is not stationary.

3) We write $(D\ell)_{D,S}, (D\ell)_{D,S}^*$ when D is a normal filter on λ and replace “stationary” by “ $\in D^+$ ”.

Discussion 1.15. 1) Of course, $(D\ell)_S$ is a relative of the diamond, see [15].

2) $(D\ell)_S^*$ is equivalent to $\diamond_S^*$ when λ is a successor cardinal but is not when λ is a limit (regular) cardinal.

3) Trivially $(D\ell)_S^* \Rightarrow (D\ell)_S$.

Definition 1.16. 1) The tree-power, $\chi^{<\sigma>\text{tr}}$ is $\sup\{\lim_\sigma(\mathcal{T}) : \mathcal{T} \subseteq {}^\sigma\chi \text{ is a tree with } \leq \chi \text{ nodes and } \leq \sigma \text{ levels}\}$ where $\lim_\sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \{\eta \in {}^\sigma\chi : (\forall \varepsilon < \sigma)(\eta \restriction \varepsilon \in \mathcal{T})\}$.

2) Let $\chi^{<\theta>\text{tr}} \geq^+ \lambda$ mean that there is a tree with θ levels, χ nodes and $\geq \lambda$ distinct θ -branches.

Claim 1.17. 1) If $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) < \lambda$ and $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\kappa>\text{tr}} < \lambda$ and $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ is a stationary subset of λ , then $(D\ell)_S$.

2) If μ is a strong limit cardinal and $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \mu$, then $\mu > \sup\{\kappa < \mu : \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) \text{ and } (\exists \alpha < \lambda)(|\alpha|^{<\kappa>\text{tr}} \geq \lambda)\}$.

3) If $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} > \beth_\omega$, then $\{\kappa : \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) \text{ and } \beth_\omega(\kappa) < \lambda \text{ and } \neg(D\ell)_{S_\kappa^\lambda} \text{ or just } \neg(D\ell)_S^* \text{ for some stationary } S \in \check{I}_\kappa[\lambda]\}$ is finite.

4) If $\lambda = \chi^+$ and $S \subseteq \lambda$ is stationary, then $(D\ell)_S^*$ is equivalent to $\diamond_S$.

Proof 1), 2), 3): See [27].

(1.3.23)

4) A result of Kunen; for a proof of a somewhat more general result in [16] $\square_{1.17}$

Now by [26, 1.10] used in 1.22, 1.25.

Theorem 1.18. Assuming $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\lambda = \text{cf}(2^\mu)$ we have $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, < \mu, J)$ when :

- (a) $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa, \lambda = \text{cf}(2^\mu)$
- (b) $S \subseteq S_\theta^\lambda$ is stationary
- (c) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, C_\delta \subseteq \delta, |C_\delta| < \mu$

¹that is, there are $A_\alpha \in J$ for $\alpha < \sigma_2$ such that $u \subseteq \sigma_2 \wedge |u| \geq \sigma_1^+ \Rightarrow \cup\{A_\alpha : \alpha \in u\} = \text{Dom}(J)$.

- (d) $\chi < 2^\mu \Rightarrow \chi^{<\theta>\text{tr}} < 2^\mu$
- (e) $|\{C_\delta \cap \alpha : \alpha \in C_\delta\}| < \lambda$ for $\alpha < \lambda$.

Remark 1.19. 1) Of course, if $S \in \check{I}_\kappa[\lambda]$ is stationary then there is $\bar{C}$ as in clauses (c) + (e) (and, of course, (b)).

2) There are such stationary S as $\kappa^+ < \mu < \lambda$.

Definition 1.20. We say a filter D on a set X is weakly λ -saturated when there is no partition $\langle X_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ of X such that $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow X_\alpha \in D^+ := \{Y \subseteq X : X \setminus Y \notin D\}$.

* * *

A notable consequence of the analysis in this work is the BB (Black Box) Trichotomy Theorem 1.22.

Remark 1.21. Using below $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ or using $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in S \rangle$ does not make a real difference.

The BB Trichotomy Theorem 1.22. *If $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\kappa > \sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma)$, then at least one of the following holds:*

- (A) $_{\mu, \kappa}$ *there is a μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality 2^μ*
- (B) (a) $\lambda := 2^\mu = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ (so λ is regular) and $\chi < \lambda \Rightarrow \chi^\sigma < \lambda$
- (b) $_{\mu, \kappa}$ *if $S \subseteq S_\sigma^\lambda$ is stationary, $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is a ladder system (i.e., $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$), then*
 - (i) $\bar{C}$ *witnesses* $\text{BB}(J_S^{\text{nst}}, \kappa^+, \theta, \kappa)$ *for every $\theta < \mu$ provided that $\delta \in S \Rightarrow |C_\delta| < \mu$*
 - (ii) $\bar{C}$ *witnesses* $\text{BB}(J_S^{\text{nst}}, \kappa^+, (2^\mu, \theta), \kappa)$ *for any $\theta < \mu$ provided that $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda > |\{C_\delta \cap \alpha : \alpha \in C_\delta \text{ and } \delta \in S\}|$ (so, e.g., the choice $C_\delta = \delta$ for $\delta \in S$ is alright for clause (ii)).*
- (C) $_{\mu, \kappa}$ (a) $\lambda_2 = 2^\mu$ *is regular, $\chi < \lambda_2 \Rightarrow \chi^\sigma < \lambda_2$ and $\lambda_1 = \min\{\theta : 2^\theta > 2^\mu\}$ is (regular and) $< 2^\mu$*
- (b) *like (b)(i)+(ii) of clause (B) for λ_2 but $|C_\delta| < \lambda_1$ for $\delta \in S$ (so $C_\delta = \delta$ is not alright).*
- (c) $\text{BB}(J_S^{\text{nst}}, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ *for any $\theta < \mu$ and any stationary subset S of λ_1 .*

Remark 1.23. 1) If $\kappa = \aleph_0$ above, then there is no cardinality $\sigma < \kappa$ as required, the proof still gives something say for $\sigma = \aleph_1$, and in this case we cannot get “for every stationary $S \subseteq S_\sigma^\lambda$ ”, still by [27, 3.1] one has “for all but finitely many regular $\sigma < \mu$ for almost every stationary $S \subseteq S_\sigma^\lambda$ ”; maybe see 2.13.

2) Assume $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa, \lambda = 2^\mu = \chi^+$. If χ is regular then (A) of 1.22 holds. By 3.12, there is $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S_\kappa^\lambda, \mu \text{ divides } \delta \rangle, C_\delta = \delta = \sup(C_\delta), \text{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$ and $\bar{C}$ is μ^+ -free. If in addition $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ then for every stationary $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ we have $\diamond_S$.

3) For $\lambda = \chi^+$, when χ singular, see below. What happens if $\lambda := 2^\mu$ is weakly inaccessible? Now it is plausible to satisfy, for some μ_0

- (*) (a) $\mu \leq \mu_0 < \lambda$

- (b) $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda > \text{cov}(|\alpha|, \mu_0^+, \mu, 2)$
 (b)⁺ $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda > \text{cov}(|\alpha|, \mu_0^+, \mu_0^+, 2)$.

Now (b)⁺ implies (by [2])

- (c) there is $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$ such that
 (α) $\bar{\mathcal{P}} = \langle \mathcal{P}_\alpha^* : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ such that
 (β) $|\mathcal{P}_\alpha^*| < \lambda$
 (γ) $\mathcal{P}_\alpha \subseteq \{u : |u| \leq \mu_0, u \text{ is a closed subset of } \alpha\}$
 (δ) if $\alpha \in u \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$, then $u \cap \alpha \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

This is enough for the argument above.

4) Does clause (b) suffice?

Proof of 1.22: Recall that for every $\chi \in (\mu, 2^\mu)$ there is a μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality χ (see 1.2(c)).

If for some $\chi < 2^\mu$ we have $\chi^\sigma = 2^\mu$ then by 3.6, clause (A) holds, so we can assume there is no such χ . If 2^μ is a singular cardinal then by 3.10(3), clause (A) holds, so assume $\lambda := 2^\mu$ is regular. If $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$, we shall prove clause (B), obviously clause (B)(a) holds and (B)(b)(ii) holds by 1.18 above and clause (B)(b)(i) follows as $|\{C_\delta \cap \alpha : \delta \in S \text{ satisfies } \alpha \in C_\delta\}| \leq |\alpha|^{<\sigma} \leq |\alpha|^\sigma < \lambda$.

So assume $\lambda < \lambda^{<\lambda}$, so necessarily there is $\partial < \lambda$ such that $\lambda < 2^\partial$ and clause (c) holds (recalling the first sentence in the proof and 2.7).

First, if $(\exists \chi)(\chi^\sigma = 2^\mu > \chi)$, then we get (A) by using Claim 3.6 for $J = J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$.

Second, if 2^μ is a singular cardinal clause (A) holds (see [21, II] or see 3.10(3)).

So assume $\lambda := 2^\mu$ is regular and $\chi < \lambda \Rightarrow \chi^\sigma < \lambda$.

Third, assume $\lambda_1 = \min\{\chi : 2^\chi > 2^\mu\} < \lambda_2 := 2^\mu$, then trivially clause (C)(a) holds and by Conclusion 2.7(1) clause (C)(c) hold. Clause (b) of (C) holds by [26], i.e. 1.18 - Saharon - because we are assuming $(\forall \chi < \lambda)(\chi^\sigma < \lambda)$ so clause (C) holds.

Hence we can assume $\lambda = \min\{\chi : 2^\chi > 2^\mu\}$. This implies $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$; so clause (B)(a) holds, and of course (B)(b) holds by [27], i.e. 1.18 - Saharon - as we are assuming $(\forall \chi < \lambda)(\chi^\sigma < \lambda)$, in fact $(D\ell)_S$ for every stationary $S \subseteq S_\sigma^\lambda$ by 1.17.

□_{1.22}

⟨h.7⟩

Remark 1.24. How can the Black Box Trichotomy Theorem 1.22 help?

If possibility (A) holds, we have, e.g., abelian groups as in Definition 1.11; so we have $G_0 \subseteq_{\text{pr}} G_1$ such that G_1 is torsion-free, G_0 is free, G_1 quite free, $|G_0| = \mu$ and G_1/G_0 is divisible, and a list of $|G_1| = 2^\mu$ partial endomorphisms of G_1 such that if $G_0 \subseteq_{\text{pr}} G \subseteq_{\text{pr}} G_1$, any endomorphism of G is included in one of the endomorphisms in the list. So by diagonalization we can build an endo-rigid group. On the other hand, possibilities (B),(C) help in another way: as in black boxes, see [3], (not to say like diamond).

Another neat conclusion is

Theorem 1.25. *For $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ one of the following holds:*

- (A) $\text{BB}(2^\mu, \mu^+, < \mu, \kappa)$
 (B) $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu^+, < \mu, \kappa)$ where $\lambda = \min\{\chi : 2^\mu < 2^\chi\}$
 (C) $\lambda := 2^\mu$ satisfies $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $\text{BB}(\lambda, \kappa^{+\omega+1}, < \mu, J_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa})$

- (D) $\lambda := 2^\mu$ satisfies $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $\text{BB}(\lambda, \kappa^{+\omega+1}, < \mu, J_{\kappa^{++} \times \kappa})$ and also
- $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu \wedge |\mathcal{F}| = \lambda \Rightarrow (\kappa, \kappa^{++}) \in \text{issp}(E)$
 - there is $\chi \in (\mu, \lambda)$, $\text{cf}(\chi) = \kappa^+$, $\chi^{<\kappa^+>\text{tr}} = \lambda$
 - $\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\kappa^+)^{\chi}, |\mathcal{F}| = \lambda \Rightarrow \kappa^{++} \in \text{issp}(\mathcal{F})$
 - there is κ^+ -Kurepa tree.

Proof. First, if Theorem 1.22 case (A) or case (B) holds then this holds here too, so we can assume $\lambda := 2^\mu$ satisfies $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$. Second, assume there is no $\chi \in (\mu, \lambda)$ such that $\lambda = \chi^{<\kappa^+>\text{tr}}$ then by 1.17(1) we have $(D\ell)_S$ for every stationary $S \subseteq S_{\kappa^+}^\lambda$, and then by 2.15, we can find stationary $S \subseteq S_{\kappa^+}^\lambda$ and (see 0.8(2)) a strict system $\langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ which is $(\kappa^{+\omega+1}, J_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa})$ -free hence by 1.18 we have $\text{BB}(\lambda, \kappa^{+\omega+1}, < \mu, J_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa})$ so clause (C) of the theorem holds. Hence we can assume that $\chi \in (\mu, \lambda)$ and $\lambda = {}^+ \chi^{<\kappa^+>\text{tr}}$.

Third, assume that there is no $\chi_1 \in (\mu, \lambda)$ such that $\lambda = {}^+ \chi_1^{<\kappa^{++}>\text{tr}}$, hence by 1.17(1) for every stationary $S \subseteq S_{\kappa^{++}}^\lambda$ we have $(D\ell)_S$. Again we apply 2.15 with χ here for μ there(?) and we can find a stationary set $S \subseteq S_{\kappa^{++}}^\lambda$ and ladder system $\langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ which is $(\kappa^{+\omega+1}, J_{\kappa^{++} \times \kappa^+})$ -free, hence by 1.18 we have $\text{BB}(\lambda, \kappa^{+\omega+1}, < \mu, J_{\kappa^{++}, \kappa^+})$, so by clause (D) of the theorem hold so assume there is such χ_1 without loss of generality it is minimal hence $\text{cf}(\chi_1) = \kappa^{++}$ and $\lambda = {}^+ \text{pp}_{J_{\kappa^{++}}^{\text{bd}}}(\chi_1)$. $\square_{1.25}$ (h.9d)

Observation 1.26. 1) Assume

- (A) $\lambda = \chi^+, \chi = \text{cf}(\chi) \geq \mu$ or
- (B) $\lambda = \chi^+ > \mu^+, \text{cf}([\chi]^{\leq \mu}, \subseteq) = \chi$.

Then we can find $\langle \bar{e}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $\bar{e}_\varepsilon = \langle e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$
- (b) $e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} \subseteq \alpha$ is closed
- (c) $\sup\{|e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}| : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is $< \mu$ for each $\varepsilon < \chi$
- (d) if $\alpha \in e_{\varepsilon, \beta}$ then $e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} = e_{\varepsilon, \beta} \cap \alpha$
- (e) if $\alpha < \lambda \wedge \text{cf}(\alpha) < \mu$ then for some $\varepsilon < \chi$ the set $e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}$ contains a club of α
- (f) for every $\alpha < \lambda$ and $u \in [\alpha]^{<\mu}$ for some $\varepsilon < \chi$ we have $u \subseteq e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}$.

Remark 1.27. Used in 3.12.

Proof. First assume clause (A) holds. By [19, §4] or [8, 3.7] there is a sequence $\langle \bar{e}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle$ satisfying clauses (a),(b),(d) and

- (c)' $e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}$ has cardinality $< \chi$
- (e) if $u \subseteq \alpha < \lambda$ has cardinality $< \chi$ then $u \subseteq e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}$ for some ε
- (f)' $\langle e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing.

Manipulating those $\bar{e}_\varepsilon$'s we get the desired conclusion (e.g. ignoring clause (f) choose $\langle e_\delta : \delta < \mu \text{ limit} \rangle$, e_δ a club of δ of order type $\text{cf}(\delta)$ and for $\varepsilon < \chi \wedge \delta < \mu$ we define $\bar{e}_\varepsilon^\delta = \langle e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}^\delta : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ by $e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}^\delta := \{\gamma \in e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} : \text{otp}(\gamma \cap e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}) \in e_\delta\}$, now check).

Second, assume clause (B). The proof is similar using 2.12, i.e. Dzamonja-Shelah [?]. $\square$

2. CASES OF WEAK G.C.H.

Note that if $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\lambda < 2^\mu < 2^\lambda$, then we can find a μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality λ (by the “No hole Conclusion”, 2.3 page 53, [21, II]) so by the Section Main Claim 2.2 we can deduce $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu^+, (2^\mu, \theta), \kappa)$ for $\theta < \mu$ - see conclusion 2.7.

Observe below that if $\theta = 2$, $\bar{C} = \langle C_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$, $C_\gamma \subseteq \mu$ (and $2^\mu < 2^\lambda$), then easily clause (β) of the conclusion of the Section Main Claim 2.2 below holds by counting - see 2.3(5). The point is to prove it for more colors, this is a relative of [26, 1.10] but this section is self contained. Also Definition 2.1 repeats Definition [26, 1.9].

This section is close to [26, §1] hence we try to keep similar notation.

Definition 2.1. 1) $\text{Sep}(\mu', \mu, \chi, \theta, \Upsilon)$ means that for some $\bar{f}$:

- (a) $\bar{f} = \langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu' \rangle$
- (b) f_ε is a function from ${}^\mu\chi$ to θ
- (c) for every $\varrho \in {}^{\mu'}\theta$ the set $\{\nu \in {}^\mu\chi : \text{for every } \varepsilon < \mu' \text{ we have } f_\varepsilon(\nu) \neq \varrho(\varepsilon)\}$ has cardinality $< \Upsilon$.

2) We may omit χ if $\chi = \theta$. We write $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta, \Upsilon)$ for $\text{Sep}(\mu, \mu, \theta, \theta, \Upsilon)$ and $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta)$ if for some $\Upsilon = \text{cf}(\Upsilon) \leq 2^\mu$ we have $\text{Sep}(\mu, \mu, \theta, \theta, \Upsilon)$ and $\text{Sep}(< \mu, \theta)$ if for some $\Upsilon = \text{cf}(\Upsilon) \leq 2^\mu$ and $\sigma < \mu$ we have $\text{Sep}(\sigma, \mu, \theta, \theta, \Upsilon)$. Let $\text{Sep}^+(\mu, \theta)$ mean $\text{Sep}(\mu, \mu, \theta, \theta, \mu)$.

The Section Main Claim 2.2. *Assume*

- (a) $2^\mu < 2^\lambda$
- (b) D is a μ^+ -complete filter on λ extending the co-bounded filter
- (c) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$, $C_\gamma \subseteq \mu$,
- (d) $2 \leq \theta \leq \mu$ and $\Upsilon \leq \mu$ (or just D is Υ^+ -complete)
- (e) $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta, \Upsilon)$
- (f) $\lambda = \text{Min}\{\partial : 2^\partial > 2^\mu\}$ or at least
- (f)⁻ we have $h_\xi \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ for $\xi < (2^\mu)^+$ such that $\zeta \neq \xi \Rightarrow h_\zeta \neq_D h_\xi$.

Then

- (α) if χ satisfies $\gamma < \lambda \Rightarrow \chi^{|\bar{C}_\gamma|} \leq \theta$, then we can find $\bar{f} = \langle f_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$ satisfying $f_\gamma \in {}^{(C_\gamma)}\chi$ such that (see 2.3(1)):
for every $f : \mu \rightarrow \chi$, for some $\gamma < \lambda$, $f_\gamma \subseteq f$ (and even for D^+ -many γ 's)
- (β) if $\mathbf{F}_\gamma : {}^{(C_\gamma)}(2^\mu) \rightarrow \theta$ for $\gamma < \lambda$, then we can find $\bar{c} = \langle c_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle \in {}^\lambda\theta$ such that
(*) for any $f : \mu \rightarrow 2^\mu$, for some $\gamma < \lambda$, $\mathbf{F}_\gamma(f \upharpoonright C_\gamma) = c_\gamma$ (even for D^+ -many)
- (γ) if $\bar{\chi} = \langle \chi_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ and $\gamma < \lambda \Rightarrow \prod_{\varepsilon \in C_\gamma} \chi_\varepsilon \leq \theta$, then we can find $\bar{f} = \langle f_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$ satisfying $f_\gamma \in \prod_{\varepsilon \in C_\gamma} \chi_\varepsilon$ such that for every $f \in \prod_{\varepsilon < \mu} \chi_\varepsilon$, for some $\gamma < \lambda$, $f_\gamma = f \upharpoonright C_\gamma$ (and even for D^+ -many).

Remark 2.3. 1) Of course “for D^+ many $t \in I$ we have xx ” means that D is a filter on I and $\{t \in I : t \text{ satisfies } xx\} \in D^+$, see below.

2) For D a filter on I let $\text{Dom}(D) = I$ and let $D^+ = \{A \subseteq I : I \setminus A \notin D\}$.

3) Similarly for J an ideal on I .

- 4) Note that in 2.2 clause (f) implies clause (a) and even clause (f)⁻ does. Note that clause (f) implies λ is regular (but not (f)) and clause (b) implies $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \mu$.
- 5) Concerning clause (β) in 2.2, when $\theta = 2$, this is easy: let D be the filter of co-bounded subsets of λ , and let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < 2^\mu \rangle$ list ${}^\mu(2^\mu)$, each appearing λ times. Now $\mathcal{F} := \{ \langle 1 - \mathbf{F}_\gamma(f_\alpha \upharpoonright C_\gamma) : \gamma < \lambda \rangle : \alpha < 2^\mu \}$ is a subset of ${}^\lambda 2$ of cardinality $2^\mu < 2^\lambda = |{}^\lambda 2|$. So every $\bar{c} \in {}^\lambda 2 \setminus \mathcal{F}$ is as required. We can use any filter D on λ such that $|2^\lambda/D| > 2^\mu$,
- 6) In the Main Claim 2.2 we can replace μ by any set of cardinality μ . E.g., $\omega^{>\mu}$. Hence in replacing $\bar{C}$ by $\bar{C}' = \langle C'_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$, $C'_\alpha = \omega^{>}(C_\alpha)$ in (β) of 2.2 we can assume $\text{Dom}(\mathbf{F}_\gamma) = \{f : f \text{ a function from } \omega^{>}(C_\alpha) \text{ to } 2^\mu\}$.
- 7) We may wonder if clause (e) of the assumption of the Main Claim 2.2 is reasonable; the following Claim 2.5 gives some sufficient conditions for clause (e) of 2.2 to hold.
- 8) In 2.2 we implicitly assert that $(f) \Rightarrow (f)^-$; for completeness we recall the justification (as there $(2^\mu)^+ \leq 2^\lambda$).

Observation 2.4. We have $(f) \Rightarrow (f)^-$ in 2.2, i.e. if $\lambda = \min\{\gamma : 2^\theta > 2^\mu\}$ then there are $h_\xi : \lambda \rightarrow 2^\mu$ for $\xi < 2^\lambda$ such that $\xi < \zeta < 2^\lambda \Rightarrow h_\xi \neq h_\zeta \bmod J_\lambda^{\text{bd}}$.

Proof. As $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow |\alpha 2| = 2^{|\alpha|} \leq 2^\mu$ and $\lambda \leq 2^\mu$ clearly ${}^\lambda 2 = \cup\{{}^\alpha 2 : \alpha < \lambda\}$ has cardinality 2^μ , so there is a one-to-one function $\mathbf{g}$ from ${}^\lambda 2$ onto 2^μ .

Let $\langle \eta_\xi : \xi < 2^\lambda \rangle$ list ${}^\lambda 2$ and let $h_\xi : \lambda \rightarrow 2^\mu$ be defined by $h_\xi(\alpha) = \mathbf{g}(\eta_\xi \upharpoonright \alpha)$ for $\alpha < \lambda$.

Clearly $\langle h_\xi : \xi < 2^\lambda \rangle$ is as required.

□_{2.4}

□ (d.6.5)

Claim 2.5. Clause (e) of 2.2 holds, i.e., $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta, \Upsilon)$ holds, when at least one of the following holds:

- (a) $\mu = \mu^\theta$ and $\Upsilon = \theta$
- (b) $\mathbf{U}_\theta(\mu) = \mu$ and $2^\theta < \mu$ and $\Upsilon = (2^\theta)^+$
- (c) $\mathbf{U}_J(\mu) = \mu$ where for some σ we have $J = [\sigma]^{<\theta}$, $\theta \leq \sigma$, $\sigma^\theta \leq \mu$ and $2^{<\sigma} < \mu$ and $\Upsilon = (2^{<\sigma})^+$
- (d) μ is a strong limit of cofinality $\neq \theta$, $\theta < \mu$ and $\Upsilon = (2^\theta)^+$
- (e) $\mu \geq \beth_\omega(\theta)$ and $\Upsilon = \mu$.

Recalling

Definition 2.6. 1) For J an ideal of σ and cardinal μ let $\mathbf{U}_J(\mu) = \min\{|\mathcal{P}| : \mathcal{P} \subseteq [\mu]^{<\sigma} \text{ and for every } f \in {}^\sigma \mu, \text{ for some } u \in \mathcal{P}, \text{ we have } \{\varepsilon < \theta : f(\varepsilon) \in u\} \neq \emptyset \bmod J\}$.

2) If $J = J_\sigma^{\text{bd}}$ and σ is a regular cardinal, we may write $\mathbf{U}_\sigma(\mu)$.

Proof of 2.5: By the proof of [26, 1.11], (not the statement!); however, for completeness, below we shall give the proof (after the proofs of 2.2, 2.7 and 2.8). We use mainly 2.5 clause (d).

Proof of the Main Claim 2.2: It is enough to prove clause (β), as it implies the others (using one-to-one $\mathbf{F}_\gamma$'s).

Let $\langle \mathbf{F}_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$ be as in clause (β) and we shall prove that there is $\langle c_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$ as promised therein.

By assumption (e) we have $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta, \Upsilon)$ which means (see Definition 2.1(2)) that we have $\text{Sep}(\mu, \mu, \theta, \theta, \Upsilon)$.

Let $\bar{f} = \langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ exemplify $\text{Sep}(\mu, \mu, \theta, \theta, \Upsilon)$, see Definition 2.1(1) and

(*)₀ for $\varrho \in {}^\mu \theta$ let $\text{Sol}_\varrho := \{\nu \in {}^\mu \theta : \text{for every } \varepsilon < \mu \text{ we have } \varrho(\varepsilon) \neq f_\varepsilon(\nu)\}$

where Sol stands for solutions, so by clause (c) of the Definition 2.1(1) of Sep it follows that

$$(*)_1 \quad \rho \in {}^\mu\theta \Rightarrow |\text{Sol}_\rho| < \Upsilon.$$

Let cd be a one-to-one function from ${}^\mu(2^\mu)$ onto 2^μ such that

$$\alpha = \text{cd}(\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle) \Rightarrow \alpha \geq \sup\{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\}$$

Let $\text{cd}_\varepsilon : 2^\mu \rightarrow 2^\mu$ for $\varepsilon < \mu$ be such that $\alpha < 2^\mu \Rightarrow \alpha = \text{cd}(\langle \text{cd}_\varepsilon(\alpha) : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle)$.

Let $\mathbf{H}$ be a one-to-one function from 2^μ onto ${}^\mu\theta$, such $\mathbf{H}$ exists as $2 \leq \theta \leq \mu$ by clause (d) of the assumption. For $\varrho \in {}^\mu\theta$ let $\text{Sol}'_\varrho := \{\alpha < 2^\mu : \mathbf{H}(\alpha) \in \text{Sol}_\varrho\}$, so

$$(*)_2 \quad \varrho \in {}^\mu\theta \Rightarrow |\text{Sol}'_\varrho| < \Upsilon.$$

Clearly in the assumption, if clause (f) holds, then clause (f)⁻ holds (see 2.4), so we can assume that $\langle h_\xi : \xi < (2^\mu)^+ \rangle$ are as in clause (f)⁻ so in particular $h_\xi \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$.

Fix $\xi < (2^\mu)^+$ for a while.

For $\gamma < \lambda$ let

$$(*)_3 \quad \varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^* := \mathbf{H}(h_\xi(\gamma)) \in {}^\mu\theta.$$

Let $\varepsilon < \mu$. Recall that $\varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^* \in {}^\mu\theta$ for $\gamma < \lambda$ and f_ε is a function from ${}^\mu\theta$ to θ so $f_\varepsilon(\varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^*) < \theta$. Hence we can consider the sequence $\bar{c}_\varepsilon^\xi = \langle f_\varepsilon(\varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^*) : \gamma < \lambda \rangle \in {}^\lambda\theta$ as a candidate for being as required in the desired conclusion (*) from clause (β) of the Main Claim 2.2. If one of them is, we are done. So assume towards a contradiction that for each $\varepsilon < \mu$ (recall we are fixing $\xi < (2^\mu)^+$) there is a sequence $\eta_\varepsilon^\xi \in {}^\mu(2^\mu)$ that exemplifies the failure of $\bar{c}_\varepsilon^\xi$ to satisfy (*), hence there is a set $E_\varepsilon^\xi \in D$, so necessarily a subset of λ , such that

$$(*)_4 \quad \gamma \in E_\varepsilon^\xi \Rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\gamma(\eta_\varepsilon^\xi \upharpoonright C_\gamma) \neq f_\varepsilon(\varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^*).$$

Define $\eta_\xi^* \in {}^\mu(2^\mu)$ by

$$\boxtimes_1 \quad \eta_\xi^*(\alpha) = \text{cd}(\langle \eta_\varepsilon^\xi(\alpha) : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle) \text{ for } \alpha < \mu; \text{ so } \eta_\xi^* \in {}^\mu(2^\mu) \text{ for our } \xi < (2^\mu)^+.$$

By clause (b) in the assumption of our Main Claim 2.2, the filter D is μ^+ -complete hence

$$(*)_5 \quad E_\xi^* := \cap \{E_\varepsilon^\xi : \varepsilon < \mu\} \text{ belongs to } D.$$

Now we vary $\xi < (2^\mu)^+$. For each such ξ we have chosen $\eta_\xi^* \in {}^\mu(2^\mu)$, and clearly the number of such η_ξ^* 's is $\leq |{}^\mu(2^\mu)| = (2^\mu)^\mu = 2^\mu$ hence for some η^* and unbounded $\mathcal{U} \subseteq (2^\mu)^+$ we have $\xi \in \mathcal{U} \Rightarrow \eta_\xi^* = \eta^*$.

For $\varepsilon < \mu$ we define $\eta'_\varepsilon \in {}^\mu(2^\mu)$ by $\eta'_\varepsilon(\alpha) = \text{cd}_\varepsilon(\eta^*(\alpha))$. So by the choice of η_ξ^*

$$\boxtimes_2 \quad \text{if } \xi \in \mathcal{U}, \text{ then } \varepsilon < \mu \Rightarrow \eta_\varepsilon^\xi = \eta'_\varepsilon.$$

So by $(*)_4 + (*)_5$

$$\boxtimes_3 \quad \text{if } \gamma \in E_\xi^* \text{ where } \xi \in \mathcal{U} \text{ then } \varepsilon < \mu \Rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\gamma(\eta'_\varepsilon \upharpoonright C_\gamma) \neq f_\varepsilon(\varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^*).$$

So noting $\langle \mathbf{F}_\gamma(\eta'_\varepsilon \upharpoonright C_\gamma) : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle \in {}^\mu\theta$, clearly by $(*)_0$ we have:

$$\boxtimes_4 \quad \text{if } \gamma \in E_\xi^* \text{ where } \xi \in \mathcal{U}, \text{ then } \varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^* \in \text{Sol}_{\langle \mathbf{F}_\gamma(\eta'_\varepsilon \upharpoonright C_\gamma) : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle}.$$

As ξ was any member of $\mathcal{U}$, by the choice of $\varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^*$, i.e. $(*)_3$ which says that $\varrho_{\xi,\gamma}^* = \mathbf{H}(h_\xi(\gamma))$ and the definition of Sol' (just before $(*)_2$), we have

$$\boxtimes_5 \quad \text{if } \xi \in \mathcal{U}, \text{ then } \gamma \in E_\xi^* \Rightarrow h_\xi(\gamma) \in \text{Sol}'_{\langle \mathbf{F}_\gamma(\eta'_\varepsilon \upharpoonright C_\gamma) : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle}.$$

Let $\bar{\xi} = \langle \xi_i : i < \Upsilon \rangle$ be a sequence of pairwise distinct members of $\mathcal{U}$, this is possible as $\mathcal{U}$ is an unbounded subset of $(2^\mu)^+$ and $\Upsilon \leq \mu$ (see clause (d) of the assumption).

As D is μ^+ -complete and $\Upsilon \leq \mu$ also $E^* := \cap\{E_{\xi_i}^* : i < \Upsilon\}$ belongs to D . By the above,

$$\gamma \in E^* \wedge i < \Upsilon \Rightarrow h_{\xi_i}(\gamma) \in \text{Sol}'_{(\mathbf{F}_\gamma(\eta'_\varepsilon \upharpoonright C_\gamma) : \varepsilon < \mu)}.$$

But by $(*)_2$ we have $|\text{Sol}'_{(\mathbf{F}_\gamma(\eta'_\varepsilon \upharpoonright C_\gamma) : \varepsilon < \mu)}| < \Upsilon$, hence by $\boxtimes_5$ for each $\gamma \in E^*$ we can choose $i_\gamma < j_\gamma < \Upsilon$ such that $h_{\xi_{i_\gamma}}(\gamma) = h_{\xi_{j_\gamma}}(\gamma)$.

As $\Upsilon \leq \mu$ and D is μ^+ -complete clearly for some $i < j < \Upsilon$ the set $\{\gamma \in E^* : i_\gamma = i \wedge j_\gamma = j\}$ is $\neq \emptyset \bmod D$. As $i < j$, by the choice of ξ we have $\xi_i \neq \xi_j$ and by the previous sentences $\{\gamma \in E^* : h_{\xi_i}(\gamma) = h_{\xi_j}(\gamma)\} \neq \emptyset \bmod D$. But this contradicts the choice of $\langle h_\zeta : \zeta < (2^\mu)^+ \rangle$, i.e., clause $(f)^-$ of the assumption. $\square_{2.2}$ (d.6)

Conclusion 2.7. 1) $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ and even $\text{BB}(J_\lambda^{\text{nst}}, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ - see Definition 0.2 - holds when $\theta < \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\mu < \lambda < 2^\mu < 2^\lambda$; moreover if $\lambda = \text{Min}\{\partial : 2^\partial > 2^\mu\}$, then we can replace λ by any μ^+ -complete ideal on λ and use any $\bar{C} = \langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle, C_\alpha \subseteq \mu$.

2) $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu^+, (2^\mu, \theta), \kappa)$ - see Definition 0.4 - holds when θ, μ, λ are as above.

Proof: 1) Let $\Upsilon = (2^{\theta+\kappa^+})^+$, so $\Upsilon < \mu$. By case (d) of 2.5, we have $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta, \Upsilon)$. Let $\langle C_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$ be a μ^+ -free family of subset of μ each of order type κ and let $\langle S_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ be a partition of λ to λ (pairwise disjoint) sets each of cardinality λ and let $\langle \xi_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ list S_i in increasing order. It suffices for each $i < \lambda$ to find a function $\mathbf{c}_i$ with domain S_i , (such that $\mathbf{c}_i(\gamma) \in {}^{(C_\gamma)}\theta$ as in Definition 1.3).

Clearly $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 := \text{Min}\{\partial : 2^\partial > 2^\mu\}$, so if equality holds, by 2.4 there are $h_\xi \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ for $\xi < 2^\lambda$ such that $\zeta \neq \varepsilon \Rightarrow h_\zeta \neq_{J_\lambda^{\text{bd}}} h_\varepsilon$. So we can apply the Section Main Claim 2.2 with D taken to be the club filter and with $\langle C_{\xi,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ here standing for $\bar{C}$ there; we get $\mathbf{c}'_i$ with domain λ let $\mathbf{c}_i$ have domain $S_i, \mathbf{c}_i(\xi_{i,\alpha}) = \mathbf{c}'_i(\alpha)$ it is as required. If otherwise, i.e., $\lambda > \lambda_0$, the result follows by monotonicity of BB in λ .

2) The proof is similar. $\square_{2.7}$ (d.11)

Conclusion 2.8. Assume we add clause (g) and replace clause (b) by $(b)^+$ in the Section Main Claim 2.2 where

$$(g) \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) \text{ and } \mathfrak{d}_\lambda > 2^\mu, \text{ recalling } \mathfrak{d}_\lambda = \text{cf}({}^\lambda\lambda, <_{J_\lambda^{\text{bd}}})$$

$$(b)^+ D \text{ is the club filter on } \lambda$$

Then we can strengthen clause (β) of the conclusion to:

- $(\beta)^+$ if $\mathbf{F}_\gamma : {}^{(C_\gamma)}(2^\mu) \rightarrow \theta$ for $\gamma < \lambda$ and $\mathbf{F}' : {}^\mu(2^\mu) \rightarrow {}^\lambda\lambda$, then we can find $\bar{c} = \langle c_\gamma : \gamma \in S_* \rangle \in {}^\lambda\theta$ with $S_* \in D^+$ such that
- (*) for any $f : \mu \rightarrow 2^\mu$ for some $\gamma < \lambda$ (and even for D^+ -many $\gamma \in S_*$) we have

$$\mathbf{F}_\gamma(f \upharpoonright C_\gamma) = c_\gamma \text{ and } (\mathbf{F}'(f))(\gamma) < \min(S_* \setminus (\gamma + 1))$$

Proof. Note that clause $(b)^+$ here implies clause (b) from 2.2, so the conclusion of 2.2 holds. We do not have to repeat the proof of the Section Main Claim 2.2 just to quote it as $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{F}'(f) : f \text{ a function from } \mu \text{ to } 2^\mu\}$ is a subset of ${}^\lambda\lambda$ of cardinality 2^μ . Now we apply a result from Cummings-Shelah [1] that $\mathfrak{d}_\lambda = \text{cf}({}^\lambda\lambda, <_{J_\lambda^{\text{nst}}})$ hence

there is $f_* \in {}^\lambda \lambda$ such that the set $\{\alpha < \lambda : f(\alpha) < f_*(\alpha)\}$ is a stationary subset of λ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $S_* = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta \text{ a limit ordinal and } \alpha < \delta \Rightarrow f_*(\alpha) < \delta\}$, now apply 2.2 for $D + S_*$. $\square_{2.8}$

Proof. Proof of 2.5 Our claim gives sufficient conditions for $\text{Sep}(\mu, \mu, \theta, \theta, \Upsilon)$.

The cases 1-4 below cover all the clauses (a)-(e) of the claim 2.5 using freely “ $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta, \Upsilon)$ is preserving by increasing Υ ”. Now Clause (a) is covered by case 1, clause (b) follows from clause (c) for the case $\sigma = \theta^+$, clause (c) by Case 2, clause (d) by Case 3 and clause (e) by Case 4.

Case 1: $\mu = \mu^\theta, \Upsilon = \theta, \chi \in [\theta, \mu]$ and we shall prove $\text{Sep}(\mu, \mu, \chi, \theta, \theta)$. Let

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ f : \begin{array}{l} f \text{ is a function with domain } {}^\mu(\chi) \text{ into } \theta \text{ and} \\ \text{for some } u \in [\mu]^\theta \text{ and sequence } \bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_i : i < \theta \rangle \\ \text{with no repetition, } \rho_i \in {}^u(\chi), \text{ we have} \\ (\forall \nu \in {}^\mu \chi)[\rho_i \subseteq \nu \Rightarrow f(\nu) = i] \text{ and} \\ (\forall \nu \in {}^\mu \chi)[(\bigwedge_{i < \theta} (\rho_i \not\subseteq \nu)) \Rightarrow f(\nu) = 0] \end{array} \right\}.$$

We write $f = f_{u, \bar{\rho}}^*$, if $u, \bar{\rho}$ witness that $f \in \mathcal{F}$ as above.

Recalling $\mu = \mu^\theta$, clearly $|\mathcal{F}| = \mu$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\}$ and we let $\bar{f} = \langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$. Clearly clauses (a),(b) of Definition 2.1 (with μ, μ, χ, θ here standing for μ', μ, χ, θ there) hold; let us check clause (c). So suppose $\varrho \in {}^\mu \theta$ and let $R = R_\varrho := \{\nu \in {}^\mu(\chi) : \text{for every } \varepsilon < \mu \text{ we have } f_\varepsilon(\nu) \neq \varrho(\varepsilon)\}$. We have to prove $|R| < \theta$ (as we have chosen $\Upsilon = \theta$).

Towards contradiction, assume that $R \subseteq {}^\mu(\chi)$ has cardinality $\geq \theta$ and choose $R' \subseteq R$ of cardinality θ . Hence we can find $u \in [\mu]^\theta$ such that $\langle \nu \upharpoonright u : \nu \in R' \rangle$ is without repetitions.

Let $\{\nu_i : i < \theta\}$ list R' without repetitions and let $\rho_i := \nu_i \upharpoonright u$ for $i < \theta$. Now let $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_i : i < \theta \rangle$, so $f_{u, \bar{\rho}}^*$ is well-defined and belongs to $\mathcal{F}$. Hence for some $\zeta < \mu$ we have $f_{u, \bar{\rho}}^* = f_\zeta$. Now for each $i < \theta, \nu_i \in R' \subseteq R$, hence by the definition of $R, (\forall \varepsilon < \mu)(f_\varepsilon(\nu_i) \neq \varrho(\varepsilon))$ and, in particular, for $\varepsilon = \zeta$, we get $f_\zeta(\nu_i) \neq \varrho(\zeta)$. But by the choice of $\zeta, f_\zeta(\nu_i) = f_{u, \bar{\rho}}^*(\nu_i)$ and by the definition of $f_{u, \bar{\rho}}^*$, recalling $\nu_i \upharpoonright u = \rho_i$, we have $f_{u, \bar{\rho}}^*(\nu_i) = i$, so $i = f_\zeta(\nu_i) \neq \varrho(\zeta)$. This holds for every $i < \theta$ whereas $\varrho \in {}^\mu \theta$, contradiction.

Case 2: $2^{<\sigma} \leq \mu, \sigma^\theta \leq \mu, \theta < \sigma, J = [\sigma]^{<\theta}$ so is an ideal on $\sigma, \mathbf{U}_J(\mu) = \mu, \Upsilon = (2^{<\sigma})^+$ recalling Definition 2.6.

Let $\{u_i : i < \mu\} \subseteq [\mu]^{\leq \sigma}$ exemplify $\mathbf{U}_J(\mu) = \mu$. Define $\mathcal{F}$ as in case 1 except that for notational simplicity $\chi = \theta$ and we restrict ourselves in the definition of $\mathcal{F}$ to $u \in \mathcal{P} := \bigcup \{[u_i]^{\leq \theta} : i < \mu\}$. As $\sigma^\theta \leq \mu$, clearly $|\mathcal{F}| = \mu$.

Assume that $\varrho \in {}^\mu \theta$ and $R = R_\varrho \subseteq {}^\mu \theta$ is defined as in Case 1, and toward a contradiction assume that $|R| \geq \Upsilon = (2^{<\sigma})^+$. We can find $\nu^*, \langle (\alpha_\zeta, \nu_\zeta) : \zeta < \sigma \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $\nu^*, \nu_\zeta \in R_\varrho$
- (b) $\alpha_\zeta < \mu$
- (c) $\nu_\zeta \upharpoonright \{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \zeta\} = \nu^* \upharpoonright \{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \zeta\}$
- (d) $\nu_\zeta(\alpha_\zeta) \neq \nu^*(\alpha_\zeta)$.

[Why? Obvious, as in the proof of Erdős-Rado theorem; let $\langle \eta_i : i < \Upsilon \rangle$ be a sequence with no repetition of members of R . For each $j < \Upsilon$, we try to choose by induction on $\zeta < \sigma$ ordinal $i(j, \zeta), \alpha_j, \zeta$ such that

- (a) $i(j, \zeta) < j$ is increasing with ζ
- (b) $\alpha_{j, \zeta} = \min\{\alpha : \eta_j(\alpha) \neq \eta_{i(j, \zeta)}(\alpha)\}$
- (c) $i(j, \zeta) = \min\{i : i(j, \varepsilon) < i < j \text{ and } \eta_i(\alpha_{j, \varepsilon}) = \eta_i(\alpha_{j, \zeta}) \text{ for } \varepsilon < \zeta\}$.

If we succeed for some j we are done. Otherwise for each $j < \Upsilon$ there is $\xi(j) < \sigma$ such that $(i(j, \zeta), \alpha_{j, \zeta})$ is well defined iff $\zeta < \xi(j)$.

Let $\mathcal{T} = \{ \langle (i(j, \zeta), \alpha_{j, \zeta}) : \zeta < \xi \rangle : j < \Upsilon \text{ and } \xi \leq \xi(j) \}$ it is, under $\triangleleft$, a tree with $\leq \sigma$ levels, is normal, has a root and each node has at most θ immediate successors, hence $|\mathcal{T}| \leq \sum_{i < \sigma} |\theta|^i = \Sigma\{|\theta|^i : i \in [\theta, \sigma)\} = \Sigma\{2^{|\theta|^i} : i \in [\theta, \sigma)\} = 2^{<\sigma}$. But $j \mapsto \langle (i(j, \zeta), \alpha_{j, \zeta}) : \zeta < \xi(j) \rangle$ is a one-to-one function from Υ into $\mathcal{T}$, contradiction.]

Clearly $\langle \alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \sigma \rangle$ has no repetitions.

So by the choice of $\{u_i : i < \mu\}$ as exemplifying $\mathbf{U}_J(\mu) = \mu$, i.e., the definition of $\mathbf{U}_J(\mu)$ and the choice of J , for some $i < \mu$ the set $u_i \cap \{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \sigma\}$ has cardinality $\geq \theta$; choose a subset u of this intersection of cardinality θ , hence $u \in \mathcal{P}$. So $\{\nu \upharpoonright u : \nu \in R\}$ has cardinality $\geq \theta$; without loss of generality $u = \{\alpha_{\zeta_i} : i < \theta\}$ with ζ_i increasing with i , and let $\rho_i^* = \nu_{\zeta_i} \upharpoonright u$ for $i < \theta$ and we can continue as in Case 1.

If we wish to use $\chi \in [\theta, \mu]$ instead of $\chi = \theta$ above, let pr be a pairing function on μ . Without loss of generality each u_i is closed under pr and its inverses, and $f_{u, \bar{p}}^*$ is defined iff for some $\varepsilon < \mu$ we have $u \subseteq u_\varepsilon$ and $i < \theta \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(\rho_i) \subseteq u_\varepsilon$. In the end, choose i such that $u_i \cap \{\text{pr}(\alpha_\zeta, \text{pr}(\rho_\zeta(\alpha_\zeta), \rho^*(\alpha_\zeta))) : \zeta < \theta\}$ has cardinality θ .

Case 3: $\mu > \theta \neq \text{cf}(\mu)$ and μ is a strong limit cardinal.

This follows by case 2. Choosing $\sigma = \theta, \Upsilon = (2^{<\sigma})^+$.

Case 4: $\mu \geq \beth_\omega(\theta)$ and $\Upsilon = \mu$.

By [25] or see [27] we can find a regular $\sigma < \beth_\omega(\theta)$ which is greater than θ and such that $\mathbf{U}_\sigma(\mu) = \mu$ (i.e., the ideal is J_σ^{bd}), so Case 2 applies. □2.5

* * *

For $\square_3$ of §0 (earlier we know it when χ is regular, using partial squares which holds by [19, §4]).

Theorem 2.9. *If $\lambda = 2^\chi = \chi^+ > \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) \neq \text{cf}(\chi)$, then $\diamond_{S_\kappa^\lambda}$ moreover $\diamond_S$ for every stationary $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$.*

Proof. By [30]. □

Of course

Observation 2.10. 1) If $\bar{C} = \langle C_\alpha : \alpha \in [\mu, \lambda) \rangle, C_\alpha \subseteq \mu$ non-empty and $2^\mu = \lambda$ (e.g. $\lambda = \mu^\kappa \wedge \mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$), then $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, \lambda, *)$, see 0.2(4).

2) If in addition $\text{otp}(C_\alpha) = \kappa$ and $\bar{C}$ is μ_1 -free, then $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu_1, \lambda, \kappa)$.

Proof. Easy, but we shall give details.

1) Let $S = [\mu, \lambda)$ and let $\langle S_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ be a partition of S to sets each of cardinality λ . Recalling Definition 0.2. It suffices to prove $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C} \upharpoonright S_\varepsilon, \lambda, *)$ for each $\varepsilon < \lambda$, so fix ε now in Definition 0.2 clause (A) is obvious, so let us prove clause (B), so let $\langle \mathbf{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in S_\varepsilon \rangle$ and $\mathbf{F}_\alpha : {}^{(C_\alpha)}\lambda \rightarrow \lambda$ be given and we should choose $\bar{c} \in {}^{(S_\varepsilon)}\theta$.

Let $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in S_\varepsilon \rangle$ list ${}^\mu\lambda$, each appearing unboundedly often (and even stationarily often), and choose $c_\alpha := \mathbf{F}_\alpha(f_\alpha \upharpoonright C_\alpha)$. Now check.

2) Look at the definitions. □_{2.10}

Discussion 2.11. 1) We use 2.10, e.g. in 1.25.

2) We may try to strengthen the results on $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta, \kappa)$ assuming $\mu^\sigma = \mu$, a case which is unnatural for [11] but may be helpful.

Claim 2.12. Assume $\chi < \chi^+ < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda)$ and $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \text{cf}([\alpha]^{\leq \chi}, \subseteq) < \lambda$.

1) If $2^\sigma < \lambda, \sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma) \leq \chi$ and $\lambda = \lambda^{< \lambda}$, then $(D\ell)_{S_\sigma}^*$.

2) We can find $\bar{\mathcal{P}} = \langle \mathcal{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $\mathcal{P}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$
- (b) $|\mathcal{P}_\alpha| < \lambda$
- (c) if $u \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$, then $|u| \leq \chi$
- (d) if $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_\alpha$ and $\beta \in u$, then $u \cap \beta \in \mathcal{P}_\beta$.

3) Let $\lambda = \chi^+$. We can find $\bar{e}_\varepsilon = \langle e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ for $\varepsilon < \chi$ such that

- (a) $u \subseteq \alpha \wedge |u| \leq \chi_1 \Rightarrow (\exists \varepsilon)(u \subseteq e_{\varepsilon, \alpha})$
- (b) $e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} \subseteq \alpha$ is closed, $|e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}| \leq \chi_1$
- (c) $\alpha \in e_{\beta, \beta} \Rightarrow e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} = e_{\varepsilon, \beta} \cap \alpha$.

Proof. 1) By [27].

2), 3) See Dzamonja-Shelah [2]. □_{2.12}

Claim 2.13. $\bar{C}$ is $(\aleph_\theta, J)$ -free and even $(\theta^{+\theta}, J)$ -free when:

- (a) $\mu > \text{cf}(\mu) = \kappa, \theta \in (\kappa, \mu)$ is regular
- (b) $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a sequence of regular cardinals $< \mu$ with $\lim_J(\bar{\lambda}) = \mu$
- (c) $J = J_{\theta * \kappa} \{A \subseteq \kappa : \text{for every large enough } \alpha < \theta \text{ for every large enough } i < \kappa \text{ we have } \kappa\alpha + i \notin A\} \supseteq J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$ is an ideal
- (d) $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_J)$ is exemplified by $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$
- (e) $S \subseteq S_\theta^\lambda \cap S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{gd}}$ is stationary (on $S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{gd}}$ see Definition 2.17 below), $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \mu \mid \delta$
- (f) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is an S -club system, $\text{otp}(C_\delta) = \theta, C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$
- (g) if $\delta \in S, \alpha < \kappa$ and $i < \kappa$, then the $(\kappa\alpha + i)$ -th member of C_δ is equal to $f_\delta(i)$ modulo μ .

Remark 2.14. Used in 4.12 more. Do more generally as required there.

Proof. The proof is as in Magidor-Shelah [6] where the assumptions are quite specific. □_{2.13}

Hence

Claim 2.15. Assume $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu$, $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) = {}^+ \text{pp}_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}}(\mu)$.

Then there is a $(\kappa^{+\kappa+1}, J_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa})$ -free ladder system $\langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$, $S \subseteq S_{\kappa^+}^\lambda$.

Remark 2.16. Used in 1.25.

Recall (see [21, ChII], more in [6]).

Definition 2.17. Assume J is an ideal of κ and $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*) \rangle$ is a $<_J$ -increasing sequence of members of ${}^\kappa \text{Ord}$.

1) Let $S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{gd}}$, the good set of S , be $\{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) > \kappa \text{ and we can find sequence } \bar{A} = \langle A_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle \text{ witnessing } \delta \text{ is a good point of } \bar{f} \text{ which means:}$

- $u \subseteq \delta = \sup(u)$
- $A_\alpha \in J$ for $\alpha \in u$
- if $\alpha < \beta$ are from u and $i \in \kappa \setminus A_\alpha \setminus A_\beta$ then $f_\alpha(i) < f_\beta(i)$.

2) Let $S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{bd}}$ be the set of $\{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) > \kappa \text{ and } \bar{f} \restriction \delta \text{ has a } <_J\text{-lub}\} \setminus S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{gd}}$.

3) $S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{ch}} = S_{>\kappa}^\lambda \setminus S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{gd}} \setminus S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{bd}}$.

Remark 2.18. The problem is in proving $\text{TDU}_{\aleph_\omega}$ is to have $(D\ell)_S$ assuming $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$; this would have solved the problem in §0. As in many cases here, it is very persuasive but we do not know to prove this in full generality.

Claim 2.19. If $\circledast$ below holds then we can find a θ -free, κ -ladder system $\bar{C}' = \langle C'_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ such that $(\forall \alpha \in C'_\delta)(\exists! \beta \in C_\delta)[\alpha + \mu = \beta + \mu]$ moreover there is $\langle f_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle \in {}^S \mathcal{F}$ without repetitions such that $C'_\delta \subseteq \{\beta + i : \beta \in C_\delta, i < \mu \text{ and } (\exists \alpha, j)(\mu \mid \alpha \wedge j < \mu \wedge \beta = \alpha + j \wedge \beta + i = \alpha + \text{cd}(\text{otp}(C_\delta \cap \alpha), i, f_\delta(\text{otp}(C_\delta \cap \alpha)))\}$, when

- $\circledast$ (a) $S \subseteq \lambda$ is stationary and $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \mu \mid \delta$
- (b) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is a κ -ladder system
- (c) $\mu < \lambda$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ has cardinality $\geq \lambda$ and is θ -free
- (d) $\text{cd}: \kappa \times \mu \times \mu \rightarrow \mu$ is one-to-one.

Proof. Straight.

□_{2.19}

3. GETTING LARGE μ^+ -FREE SUBSETS OF ${}^\kappa\mu$

Recall that $\mu = \mathbf{C}_\kappa \Rightarrow \text{pp}(\mu) = {}^+ 2^\mu$ and easily (see 2.10(2))

- $\boxplus$ if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ is μ_1 -free and $\lambda = |\mathcal{F}| = 2^\mu$, then $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu_1, \lambda, \kappa)$ and hence TDU_{μ_1} holds.

This is a motivation of the investigation here, i.e., trying to get more cases of μ^+ -free subsets of ${}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality $\text{pp}(\mu)$. In 3.1 the case before our eyes is $\mu = \beth_\omega, \mu < \chi < \lambda = \beth_{\omega+1}(= 2^\mu)$, $\text{cf}(\chi) = \theta \in [\aleph_\omega, \mu)$.

Claim 3.1. *There is a set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality λ satisfying $\boxtimes$ if $\circledast$ holds where*

- $\boxtimes$ (α) the set $\mathcal{F}$ is θ -free
- (β) $\mathcal{F}$ is $(\mu^+, (2^\theta)^+)$ -free - see Definition 1.3
- $\circledast$ (a) $\mu < \chi < \lambda$
- (b) $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu$
- (c) θ is regular (naturally but not necessarily $\theta = \text{cf}(\chi)$)
- (d) $\kappa < \theta < \mu$ or just $\kappa \neq \theta$ are $< \mu$
- (e) $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\theta < \mu$
- (f) $J = J_1$ is a κ -complete ideal on κ
- (g) $\chi^{<\theta>\text{tr}} \geq {}^+ \lambda$ as witnessed by $\mathcal{T}$; i.e., the tree $\mathcal{T}$ has θ levels,
 $\leq \chi$ nodes and $\geq \lambda$ distinct θ -branches
- (h) $\text{pp}_{J_1}^+(\mu) > \chi$.

Claim 3.2. *In Claim 3.1 we can replace $\circledast$ by $\circledast'$ and $\boxtimes(\beta)$ by $\boxtimes'(\beta)'$ below, i.e. there is $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality λ such that*

- $\boxtimes'$ (α) the set $\mathcal{F}$ is θ_1 -free
- (β)' $\mathcal{F}$ is (μ^+, σ) -free
- $\circledast'$ (a) $\mu < \chi < \lambda$
- (b) $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu$
- (c) J_2 is an ideal on θ
- (d) $J = J_1$ is an ideal on κ
- (e) $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\theta < \mu$ hence $\theta < \mu$
- (f) J_2 is an ideal on θ such that
 - (α) either $\theta_1 \leq \theta$ and J_2 is θ_1 -complete, or
 - (β) J_1 is $\text{cf}(\theta)^+$ -complete and $J_2 = J_\theta^{\text{bd}}$ and $\theta < \kappa$ of course
- (g) there are $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\theta\chi$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $\alpha < \beta < \lambda \Rightarrow \{\varepsilon < \theta: \eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \eta_\beta(\varepsilon)\} \in J_2$
- (h) there is a μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality $\geq \chi$
- (i) (α) $\mathcal{P}(\theta)/J_2$ satisfies the σ -c.c. or just
 - (β) for some κ^+ -complete ideal $J'_2 \supseteq J_2$ of θ ,
 $\sigma \geq \sup \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\theta) \setminus J'_2 \text{ and } A \neq B \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow A \cap B \in J_2\}$.

Remark 3.3. 1) Recall Definition 1.3 where we define notions of freeness for sets and for sequences.

2) If in 3.1, $\mathcal{F}$ is not necessarily (μ, θ^+) -free, $\theta > \kappa$ and $\Upsilon = \min\{\partial : \mathcal{F} \text{ is not } (\theta^+, \partial)\text{-free}\}$, then $\partial \in [\theta^+, \Upsilon) \Rightarrow (< \partial, \partial) \in \Theta$.

3) In $\boxtimes$ of Claim 3.1, we can even get a κ -Kurepa tree with $\geq \partial$ distinct κ -branches.

4) The proof of 3.1 is written so it can be adapted to become a proof of 3.2.

Proof of Claim 3.1: As $\text{cf}(\mu) = \kappa < \mu$ by clauses (b) + (d) of $\textcircled{*}$ and $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\theta < \mu$ by clause (e), we can let $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ be increasing with limit μ such that $(\mu_i)^\theta = \mu_i > 2^\theta$. Let $\mu_i^- = \bigcup_{j < i} \mu_j$; without loss of generality $\mu_i^- < \mu_i < \mu$; if $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\kappa < \mu)$, we can add $(\mu_i)^{\kappa+\theta} = \mu_i$.

There is $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_\gamma : \gamma < \chi \rangle$ such that

- (*)₁ (a) $\rho_\gamma \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \mu_i$ with no repetition; moreover $\rho_\gamma(i) \in [\mu_i^-, \mu_i)$
- (b) the set $\{\rho_\alpha : \alpha < \chi\}$ is (μ^+, J_1) -free (in fact we can add that even the sequence $\langle \rho_\alpha : \alpha < \chi \rangle$ is μ^+ -free, recalling Definition 1.3(1),(2) but immaterial here).

[Why? For any regular $\chi_1 \in (\mu, \chi]$ by clause (h) of the assumption $\textcircled{*}$, there is an increasing sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ of regular cardinals $< \mu$ such that $\chi_1 < \max \text{pcf}\{\lambda_i : i < \kappa\}$. By [21, ChVIII,§1] without loss of generality $i < \kappa \Rightarrow \lambda_i \in [\mu_i^-, \mu_i]$ and $(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}})$ has true cofinality which is $> \chi_1$. By the no-hole-

claim ([21, ChII,§2]) there are $\rho_\gamma \in \prod_{i < \kappa} [\mu_i^-, \lambda_i] \subseteq \prod_{i < \kappa} [\mu_i^-, \mu_i)$ for $\gamma < \chi_1$ such that

$\langle \rho_\gamma : \gamma < \chi_1 \rangle$ is μ^+ -free. If χ is regular, we can use $\chi_1 := \chi$. We are left with χ is singular, then use 3.10(3),(3A) with $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon = [\mu_\varepsilon^-, \mu_\varepsilon)$ and χ here standing for λ and $\text{cf}(\chi)$ here standing for δ there; $\langle \lambda_i : i < \delta \rangle$ any increasing sequence of regular cardinal $\in [\mu, \chi)$. The assumption on each λ_i there holds by what have we proved for any regular $\chi_i \in (\mu, \chi]$. So we are done.]

Let $J_2 = J_\theta^{\text{bd}}$, (for 3.2 the ideal J_2 is given in clause (f)); and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tree as in clause (g) of the assumption $\textcircled{*}$. Without loss of generality

- (*)₂ (a) $\mathcal{T} \subseteq {}^\theta \chi$ and $<_{\mathcal{T}}$ is $\triangleleft$, i.e. being an initial segment
- (b) $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathcal{T} \wedge \varepsilon < \theta \wedge \eta_1(\varepsilon) = \eta_2(\varepsilon) \Rightarrow \eta_1 \restriction \varepsilon = \eta_2 \restriction \varepsilon$.

Recall $\lim_\theta(\mathcal{T}) = \{\eta \in {}^\theta \chi : (\forall \varepsilon < \theta)(\eta \restriction \varepsilon \in \mathcal{T})\}$, so it has $\geq \lambda$ members.

Let $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be a sequence of pairwise distinct members of $\lim_\theta(\mathcal{T})$. Let $\text{cd}_* : \bigcup \{ {}^\theta(\mu_i) : i < \kappa \} \rightarrow \mu$ be one-to-one onto μ such that $\rho \in {}^\theta(\mu_i) \Leftrightarrow \text{cd}_*(\rho) < \mu_i$. Let $\langle \text{cd}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ be the sequence of functions with domain μ such that $\zeta = \text{cd}_*(\rho) \Rightarrow \rho = \langle \text{cd}_\varepsilon(\zeta) : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$. Let $\text{cd}'_\varepsilon(\zeta) = \text{cd}_\varepsilon(\text{cd}_0(\zeta))$.

Lastly, for $\alpha < \lambda$ (the extra cases are for later claims using this proof)

$\boxtimes_1$ $\nu_\alpha \in {}^\kappa \mu$ is defined as follows:

- for $i < \kappa$, let $\nu_\alpha(i) \in [\mu_i^-, \mu_i)$; be such that $\text{cd}'_\varepsilon(\nu_\alpha(i)) = \rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}(i)$ for $\varepsilon < \theta$
- if $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\kappa < \mu)$, then we can make $\nu_\alpha(i)$ code also $\nu_\alpha \restriction i$, e.g. $\text{cd}_\varepsilon(\text{cd}_1(\nu_\alpha(i)))$ code $\nu_\alpha \restriction i$
- if $\varrho_\alpha \in {}^\kappa \mu$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ are given we let $\nu_\alpha(i)$ code $\varrho_\alpha(i)$, too, e.g. $\varrho_\alpha(i) = \text{cd}_0(\text{cd}_1(\nu_\alpha(i)))$.

We shall prove that the set $\mathcal{F} = \{\nu_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is as required and let $\bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$.

Now

- $\boxtimes_2$ $\bar{\nu}$ is without repetition, i.e., $\alpha < \beta < \lambda \Rightarrow \nu_\alpha \neq \nu_\beta$: and so $\mathcal{F}$ has cardinality λ .

[Why? If $\nu_\alpha = \nu_\beta$, then for every $\varepsilon < \theta$ and $i < \kappa$, we have $\rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}(i) = \text{cd}'_\varepsilon(\nu_\alpha(i)) = \text{cd}'_\varepsilon(\nu_\beta(i)) = \rho_{\eta_\beta(\varepsilon)}(i)$. Fixing $\varepsilon < \theta$, as this holds for every $\varepsilon < \theta$ and $i < \kappa$, we conclude $\rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)} = \rho_{\eta_\beta(\varepsilon)}$. But $\langle \rho_\gamma : \gamma < \chi \rangle$ is without repetitions, hence it follows

that $\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \eta_\beta(\varepsilon)$. As this holds for every $\varepsilon < \theta$, we conclude that $\eta_\alpha = \eta_\beta$ but $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is without repetitions hence $\alpha = \beta$, so we are done.]

Now the main point is proving clauses (α) and (β) of $\boxtimes$.

Step 1: To prove clause (α) of $\boxtimes$, i.e., “ $\mathcal{F}$ is θ -free”.

Assume $w \subseteq \lambda$ and $|w| < \theta$. Recalling $(*)_1(b)$ and $\theta < \mu$, clearly the set $\{\rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)} : \alpha \in w, \varepsilon < \theta\}$ being of cardinality $\leq \theta < \mu^+$ is free, hence there is a sequence $\langle s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)} : \alpha \in w, \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ of members of J_1 such that: if $(\alpha_\ell, \varepsilon_\ell) \in w \times \theta$, for $\ell = 1, 2$, and $\eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon_1) \neq \eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon_2)$ and $i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon_1)} \setminus s_{\eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon_2)}$, then $\rho_{\eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon_1)}(i) \neq \rho_{\eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon_2)}(i)$.

Now as $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha \in w \rangle$ is a sequence of $< \theta$ distinct θ -branches of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon_1) = \eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon_2) \Rightarrow \varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$ (as $\eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon_\ell) \in [\mu_{\varepsilon_\ell}^-, \mu_{\varepsilon_\ell})$) and $\eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon) = \eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon) \Rightarrow \eta_{\alpha_1} \upharpoonright \varepsilon = \eta_{\alpha_2} \upharpoonright \varepsilon$ by $(*)_2$, i.e., the choice of $\mathcal{T}$ and the regularity of θ we can find $\varepsilon_* < \theta$ such that $\langle \eta_\alpha(\varepsilon_*) : \alpha \in w \rangle$ is with no repetitions, and define $s'_\alpha = s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon_*)} \subseteq \kappa$ for $\alpha \in w$; now $\langle s'_\alpha : \alpha \in w \rangle$ is as required.

Step 2: To prove clause (β) of $\boxtimes$.

So let $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \{\nu_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ have cardinality $\leq \mu$. Choose w such that $\mathcal{F}' = \{\nu_\alpha : \alpha \in w\}$, so $w \in [\lambda]^{\leq \mu}$ and let $u := \cup \{\text{Rang}(\eta_\alpha) : \alpha \in w\}$, clearly $u \in [\chi]^{\leq \mu}$. By the choice of $\langle \rho_\gamma : \gamma < \chi \rangle$ we can find a sequence $\langle s_\gamma : \gamma \in u \rangle$ such that $s_\gamma \in J_1$ and $i \in \kappa \setminus (s_{\gamma_1} \cup s_{\gamma_2}) \wedge \gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2 \wedge \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \subseteq u \Rightarrow \rho_{\gamma_1}(i) \neq \rho_{\gamma_2}(i)$.

For $\alpha \in w$ let $t_\alpha := \{i < \kappa : \text{the set of } \varepsilon < \theta \text{ such that } i \notin s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)} \text{ belongs to } J_2 = J_\theta^{\text{bd}}\}$.

We shall now show that $\bar{t} := \langle t_\alpha : \alpha \in w \rangle$ is as required in Definition 1.3(1),(2); that is, we have to prove that $t_\alpha \in J_1$ and that the set of α such that $i_* \notin t_\alpha \wedge \nu_\alpha(i_*) = \xi$ is small, i.e. of cardinality $\leq 2^\theta$; those are proved below in $(*)_4$ and $(*)_3$ respectively. So let $\xi < \mu$ and $i_* < \kappa$ and let $v = v_{\xi, i_*} = \{\alpha \in w : i_* \notin t_\alpha \text{ and } \nu_\alpha(i_*) = \xi\}$ and we shall prove below that

$$(*)_3 \quad |v| \leq 2^\theta.$$

This will do one half of proving “ $\bar{t}$ is as required in Definition 1.3(1),(2).”

Why does $(*)_3$ hold? Now if $\alpha \in v$, then $i_* \in \kappa \setminus t_\alpha$, hence (by the definition of t_α) we have $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha, i_*} := \{\varepsilon < \theta : i_* \notin s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}\} \in J_2^+$. So if $\alpha \neq \beta$ are from v and $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha, i_*} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\beta, i_*}$ and $\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) \neq \eta_\beta(\varepsilon)$, then we have $i_* \notin s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}$ (as $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha, i_*}$) and $i_* \notin s_{\eta_\beta(\varepsilon)}$ (as $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_{\beta, i_*}$), and hence by the choice of $\langle s_\gamma : \gamma \in u \rangle$, we have $\rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}(i_*) \neq \rho_{\eta_\beta(\varepsilon)}(i_*)$, so

$$\text{cd}'_\varepsilon(\nu_\alpha(i_*)) = \rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}(i_*) \neq \rho_{\eta_\beta(\varepsilon)}(i_*) = \text{cd}'_\varepsilon(\nu_\beta(i_*)).$$

Recall that $\nu_\alpha(i_*) = \xi = \nu_\beta(i_*)$; as $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha, i_*} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\beta, i_*}$, this is a contradiction. It follows that $\alpha \in v \wedge \beta \in v \wedge \alpha \neq \beta \wedge \varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha, i_*} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\beta, i_*} \Rightarrow \eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \eta_\beta(\varepsilon)$; but $\alpha \neq \beta \Rightarrow \{\varepsilon < \theta : \eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \eta_\beta(\varepsilon)\} \in J_2$, hence this implies $\alpha \in v \wedge \beta \in v \wedge \alpha \neq \beta \Rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\alpha, i_*} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\beta, i_*} \in J_2$. As we have noted earlier that $\alpha \in v \Rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\alpha, i_*} \in J_2^+$, it follows that $\mathcal{P}(\theta)/J_2$ fails the $|v|$ -c.c. Now for the present proof, $\mathcal{P}(\theta)$ has cardinality 2^θ , hence $\mathcal{P}(\theta)/J_2$ satisfies the $(2^\theta)^+$ -c.c., and hence $|v| \leq 2^\theta$, as required in $(*)_3$. But for proving “ $\bar{t}$ is as required in Definition 1.3, we need also the second half:

$$(*)_4 \quad t_\alpha \in J_1 \text{ for } \alpha \in v.$$

Why does $(*)_4$ hold? Firstly, assume $\kappa < \theta$; towards a contradiction assume that $t_\alpha \in (J_1)^+$, so by the choice of t_α , for each $i \in t_\alpha$, the set $\{\varepsilon < \theta : i \notin s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}\}$

belongs to J_2 , but J_2 , being J_θ^{bd} (and recalling θ is regular), is κ^+ -complete and $|t_\alpha| \leq \kappa$, hence the set

$$r_{\eta_\alpha} := \bigcup_{i \in t_\alpha} \{\varepsilon < \theta : i \notin s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}\} \in J_2$$

; hence we can choose $\varepsilon_\alpha < \theta$ such that $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon_\alpha, \theta) \Rightarrow \bigwedge_{i \in t_\alpha} i \in s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}$, so $t_\alpha \subseteq s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon_\alpha)}$, but $s_{\eta_\beta(\varepsilon)} \in J_1$, and hence $t_\alpha \in J_1$ as required.

Secondly, assume $\kappa > \theta$; towards a contradiction, assume $t_\alpha \in J_1^+$. Again $i \in t_\alpha \Rightarrow \{\varepsilon < \theta : i \notin s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}\} \in J_2$, but $J_2 = J_\theta^{\text{bd}}$, hence we can find $\bar{\varepsilon}_\alpha = \langle \varepsilon_{\alpha,i} : i \in t_\alpha \rangle \in {}^{(t_\alpha)}\theta$ such that $\varepsilon_{\alpha,i} = \sup\{\varepsilon < \theta : i \notin s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}\} < \theta$. However, J_1 is θ^+ -complete, so for some $\varepsilon_\alpha^* < \theta$, we have $t'_\alpha := \{i \in t_\alpha : \varepsilon_{\alpha,i} < \varepsilon_\alpha^*\} \in J_1^+$. So $i \in t'_\alpha \Rightarrow \varepsilon_{\alpha,i} < \varepsilon_\alpha^* \Rightarrow \sup\{\varepsilon < \theta : i \notin s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}\} < \varepsilon_\alpha^* \Rightarrow i \in s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon_\alpha^*)}$ so $t'_\alpha \subseteq s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon_\alpha^*)}$. But $s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon_\alpha^*)} \in J_1$, while $t'_\alpha \notin J_1$, contradiction. $\square_{3.1}$ (1f.7)

Proof of 3.2: We note the points of the proof of 2.2 is changed. First, the choice of $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_\gamma : \gamma < \chi \rangle$, i.e. $(*)_1$ is now done by using $\otimes'(h)$. After $(*)_2$, instead defining J_2 recall that it is given (see $\otimes'(f)$) and if J'_2 is not given (see $\otimes'(i)$) let $J'_2 = J_2$. After $(*)_2$, instead choosing $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ it is given in $\otimes(g)$ and the tree $\mathcal{T}$ disappears.

In proving “Step 1” we have another reason for our being able to choose ε_* . Of course, now $|w| < \theta_1$ as we are proving “ $\mathcal{F}$ is θ_1 -free”.

First, if clause (α) of $\otimes'(f)$ holds, as $\{\varepsilon < \theta : \eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \eta_\beta(\varepsilon)\} \in J_2$ for $\alpha \neq \beta$ from w , but J_2 is θ_1 -complete, so $\{\varepsilon < \theta : \eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \eta_\beta(\varepsilon) \text{ for some } \alpha \neq \beta \text{ from } w\}$ belongs to J_2 , hence there is $\varepsilon_* < \theta$ not in this set.

Second, if clause (β) of $\otimes'(f)$ clearly $\theta < \kappa$, so as J_1 is κ -complete it suffices to prove $\alpha < \beta < \lambda \Rightarrow s_{\alpha,\beta} = \{i < \kappa : \nu_\alpha(i) = \nu_\beta(j)\} \in J_1$ but for $\alpha \neq \beta$ we have $\eta_\alpha \neq \eta_\beta$ hence for some $\varepsilon < \theta$ we have $\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) \neq \eta_\beta(\varepsilon)$ hence $s_{\alpha,\beta} \subseteq \{i < \kappa : \rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}(i) = \rho_{\eta_\beta(\varepsilon)}(i)\} \in J_1$ so we are done.

We turn to Step 2, now defining t_α we use “belongs to J'_2 ”; then $(*)_3$ should say $|v| < \sigma$ and in the proof instead “ $\mathcal{P}(\theta)/J_2$ satisfies the $(2^\theta)^+$ -c.c.” we use clause $\otimes'(j)(\alpha)$ if it holds and $\otimes'(j)(\beta)$, as still $\alpha \neq \beta \Rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,i_*} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\beta,i_*} \in J_2$.

Lastly, in proving $(*)_4$ we use clause $\otimes'(f)$. $\square_{3.2}$ (1f.8)

Claim 3.4. *In 3.1 assuming $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\kappa < \mu)$, we can add $\mathcal{F}$ is Υ -free when (a) or (b) or (c) hold where*

Case (a) $\Upsilon = \theta^{+\omega+1}$ and we can choose $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\theta\chi$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ with no repetitions such that $\theta^+ \notin \text{issp}_J\{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$.

Case (b) $\theta^{+\omega} < \Upsilon \leq \mu$ and we can choose $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\theta\mu$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ with no repetitions such that $\theta < \partial = \text{cf}(\partial) \wedge (< \partial, \partial) \notin \text{issp}_J(\{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}) \Rightarrow \partial \geq \Upsilon$

Case (c) there are pairwise distinct $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\theta\chi$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ and $\varrho_\gamma \in {}^\kappa\mu$ for $\gamma < \chi$ such that for every regular $\partial \in (\theta + \kappa, \Upsilon)$ we have $\partial \notin \text{issp}(\{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < \partial\})$ or $\partial \notin \text{issp}(\{\rho_\gamma : \gamma < \partial\})$ but in $\boxtimes_1$ of the proof of 3.1 $\nu_\alpha(i)$ code also $\varrho_\alpha(i)$.

Proof. By 1.4 Case (a) is a special instance of Case (b) and by Definition 1.3(7), Case (b) is a special case of clause (c), so we shall deal with clause (c) only.

We shall repeat the proof of 3.1 but we use $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle, \langle \varrho_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ from the assumption (c) of 3.5.

Consider the statement

$\boxplus$ S is not a stationary subset of ∂ when:

$\odot_S$ $\partial = \text{cf}(\partial) \in (\theta, \mu), \alpha_\varepsilon < \lambda$ for $\varepsilon < \partial$ with no repetitions and S is $\{\zeta < \partial : \text{for some } \xi \in [\zeta, \partial), \text{ the set } \{i < \kappa : \nu_{\alpha_\xi}(i) \in \{\nu_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i) : \varepsilon < \zeta\}\} \text{ belongs to } J_1^+\}$.

It suffices to prove $\boxplus$:

Why? We prove that $\{\nu_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is ∂^+ -free by induction on $\partial < \Upsilon$ so let $w \subseteq \lambda$. If $\partial \leq \kappa^+$ just note that $\alpha \neq \beta \in w \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \nu_\alpha(i) = \nu_\beta(i)\} \in J_1$, if $\partial \leq \theta$ recall $\boxtimes(\alpha)$ of 3.1. If $\partial \geq \kappa^+ + \theta$ is singular use compactness for singulars. So assume $\partial = \text{cf}(\partial) \geq \kappa^+ + \theta$ so by the induction hypothesis without loss of generality $|w| = \partial$ and let $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ and define S as in $\odot_S$ above from $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$. So as we are assuming $\boxplus$, necessarily S is not a stationary subset of ∂ so let E be a club of ∂ disjoint to S . Let $\langle \varepsilon(\iota) : \iota < \partial \rangle$ list in increasing order $E \cup \{0\}$. For each $\iota < \theta$ we apply hypothesis to $w_\iota := \{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in [\varepsilon(\iota), \varepsilon(\iota+1))\}$ and get the sequence $\langle s_{\iota, \varepsilon} \in J_1 : \varepsilon \in w_\iota \rangle$.

Lastly, for $\varepsilon < \sigma$ let ι be such that $\varepsilon \in [\varepsilon(\iota), \varepsilon(\iota+1))$ and $s_\varepsilon = s_{\iota, \varepsilon} \cup \{i < \kappa : \nu_\varepsilon(i) \text{ belong to } \{\nu_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i) : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(\iota)\}\}$.

Why $\boxplus$ holds?

Towards a contradiction, suppose that the set S is stationary. By renaming: for clause (a) and the assumption (c) of 3.5 without loss of generality

- (*)₅ (a) for some stationary $S_0 \subseteq S$, for every limit $\zeta \in S_0$, ζ itself can serve as the witness ξ (in fact we can have $S \setminus S_0$ not stationary)
- (b) for some club E of ∂ , if $\varepsilon < \zeta \leq \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \in E$ then $\{i < \kappa : \nu_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i) \in \{\nu_{\alpha_{\varepsilon(1)}}(i) : \varepsilon(1) < \varepsilon\}\} \in J_1$.

Clearly $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\delta) \leq \kappa$, and because $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\kappa < \mu)$, by the second $\bullet$ in $\boxtimes_1$ we know that $\nu_\alpha(i), \theta$ determine $\nu_\alpha \upharpoonright i$ hence easily

$$(*)_6 \quad \delta \in S \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa.$$

Let

$$S_1 := \{\zeta \in S_0 : \{\varepsilon < \theta : \eta_{\alpha_\zeta}(\varepsilon) \in \{\eta_{\alpha_j}(\varepsilon) : j < \zeta\}\} \text{ belongs to } J_2^+\}.$$

Case A: S_1 is stationary.

Firstly, assume $\kappa < \theta$. As, see above, $\zeta \in S \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\zeta) \leq \kappa$ and $\theta \not\leq \kappa \Rightarrow J_2$ is κ^+ -complete, clearly for each $\zeta \in S_1$, for some $j_\zeta < \zeta$, the set $\{\varepsilon < \theta : \eta_{\alpha_\zeta}(\varepsilon) \in \{\eta_{\alpha_{j_\zeta}}(\varepsilon) : j_\zeta < \varepsilon\}\}$ belongs to J_2^+ . By Fodor's lemma, for some $j(*)$, the set $S_2 = \{\zeta \in S_1 : j_\zeta \leq j(*)\}$ is a stationary subset of ∂ . Now $\{\eta_{\alpha_\zeta} : \zeta \in S_2\}$ witnesses $(< \partial, \partial) \in \text{ussp}_{J_2}(\lim_\theta(\mathcal{T})) = \Theta$; but this contradicts a demand in case (b) of the assumption.

Secondly, if $\theta < \kappa$ but recalling $(*)_6$ (see above) $\zeta \in S \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\zeta) = \kappa$ and now the proof is similar.

Case B: $\kappa < \theta$ and S_1 is not stationary.

So necessarily $S_0 \setminus S_1$ is a stationary subset of ∂ . By the definition of S_1 (and $(*)_5$) we can find $\bar{s}^* = \langle s_\zeta^* : \zeta \in (S_0 \setminus S_1) \rangle$ such that

$$(*)_7 \quad (a) \quad s_\zeta^* \in J_2$$

- (b) if $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2$ are from $(S_0 \setminus S_1)$ and $\varepsilon \in \theta \setminus s_{\zeta_1}^* \setminus s_{\zeta_2}^*$, then
 $\eta_{\alpha_{\zeta_1}}(\varepsilon) \neq \eta_{\alpha_{\zeta_2}}(\varepsilon)$.

Let $\varepsilon(\zeta) = \min(\kappa \setminus s_{\zeta}^*)$ for $\zeta \in (S_0 \setminus S_1)$.

So for some stationary $S_2 \subseteq (S_0 \setminus S_1)$, we have $\zeta \in S_2 \Rightarrow \varepsilon(\zeta) = \varepsilon(*)$ and so

- (*)₈ $\langle \eta_{\alpha_{\zeta}}(\varepsilon(*)) : \zeta \in S_2 \rangle$ is without repetitions.

Now (*)₂(b) says that $\{\rho_{\gamma} : \gamma < \chi\}$ is (μ^+, J_1^+) -free, apply it to the subset $\{\varrho_{\eta_{\alpha_{\zeta}}(\varepsilon(*))} : \zeta \in S_2\}$ which has cardinality $\partial < \mu^+$ hence (recall (*)₈)

- (*)₉ some $\langle s_{\eta_{\alpha_{\zeta}}(\varepsilon(*))} : \zeta \in S_2 \rangle$ witnesses that $\langle \rho_{\eta_{\alpha_{\zeta}}} : \zeta \in S_2 \rangle$ is free, i.e.
 $s_{\eta_{\alpha_{\zeta}}(\varepsilon(*))} \in J_1$ for $\zeta \in S_1$ and $\zeta_1 \neq \xi \in S_2 \wedge i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\eta_{\alpha_{\zeta}}(\varepsilon(*))} \setminus s_{\eta_{\alpha_{\xi}}(\varepsilon(*))} \Rightarrow$
 $\varrho_{\eta_{\alpha_{\zeta}}(\varepsilon(*))}(i) \neq \varrho_{\eta_{\alpha_{\xi}}(\varepsilon(*))}(i)$.

As $\kappa < \partial$, for some $i(*) < \kappa$, the set $S_3 := \{\zeta \in S_2 : i(*) \in s_{\eta_{\alpha_{\zeta}}(\varepsilon(*))}\}$ is a stationary subset of ∂ . By (*)₆ we know that $\nu_{\alpha}(i) = \nu_{\beta}(i) \Rightarrow \nu_{\alpha} \upharpoonright i \nu_{\beta} \upharpoonright i$ for $\alpha, \beta < \lambda, i < \kappa; \langle \nu_{\alpha_{\varepsilon}}(i(*)) : \varepsilon \in S_2 \rangle$ is a sequence without repetitions, but by the choice of S and $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon \in S_2 \Rightarrow \nu_{\alpha_{\varepsilon}}(i(*)) \in \{\nu_{\alpha_{\zeta}}(i(*)) : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$. However, this contradicts “ $S_2 \subseteq S_0 \subseteq S$ is a stationary subset of ∂ ”. $\square_{3.5}$

Claim 3.5. *In 3.1, $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies: for $\kappa + \theta < \partial = \text{cf}(\gamma) < \lambda$, we have $\mathcal{F}$ is $(\partial, \partial^+, J_1)$ -free iff $(< \partial, \partial) \in \text{issp}(\mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. By the proof of 3.5. $\square_{3.5}$

In 3.6, the case before our eyes is $\mu = \overset{*}{\underset{*}{\underset{*}{\sqcup}}}_{\omega_1}, \kappa = \aleph_1$.

Claim 3.6. *There is $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^{\kappa}\mu$ of cardinality μ^{κ} which is (μ^+, J) -free when*

- ⊛ (a) $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) < \kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu$
- (b) $\lambda = \mu^{\kappa}$
- (c) $\mu < \chi < \chi^{\theta} = \lambda$
- (d) $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\theta} < \mu$
- (e) J is a θ^+ -complete ideal on κ
- (f) $\text{pp}_J(\mu) = {}^+\lambda$.

Remark 3.7. Used in 1.22.

Proof: Let $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ be increasing such that $(\mu_i)^{\theta} = \mu_i$ and let $\text{cd}_* : {}^{\theta}\mu \rightarrow \mu$ and cd_{ε} (for $\varepsilon < \theta$) be as in the proof of 3.1, noting that by clause (a) of the claim assumption, ${}^{\theta}\mu = \cup\{\mu_i : i < \kappa\}$ and let $\bar{\mu}_i = \cup\{\mu_j : j < i\}$.

As $\chi < \text{pp}_J(\mu)$, by 1.2(c), i.e. [21, Ch.II] there is a sequence $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_{\gamma} : \gamma < \chi \rangle$ of member of ${}^{\kappa}\mu$ which is μ^+ -free. Let $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ with $\eta_{\alpha} \in {}^{\theta}\chi$ be pairwise distinct.

Without loss of generality, $\rho_{\gamma} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} [\mu_i^-, \mu_i]$; we define $\nu_{\alpha} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \mu_i^{\theta} \subseteq {}^{\kappa}\mu$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ by $\nu_{\alpha}(i) = \text{cd}_*(\langle \rho_{\eta_{\alpha}(\varepsilon)}(i) : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle)$ for $i < \kappa$. We shall prove that $\langle \nu_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is as required, i.e. $\langle \nu_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is (μ^+, J) -free; this suffices as it implies $\alpha < \beta < \lambda \Rightarrow \nu_{\alpha} \neq \nu_{\beta}$ hence $\{\nu_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\} \subseteq {}^{\kappa}\mu$ has cardinality $\lambda = \mu^{\kappa}$ (and is (μ^+, J) -free).

For $w \in [\lambda]^{\leq \mu}$, we let $u = \cup\{\text{Rang}(\eta_{\alpha}) : \alpha \in w\}$, so u is a subset of χ of cardinality $\leq \mu$.

As $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_\alpha : \alpha < \chi \rangle$ is μ^+ -free, there is $\bar{s} = \langle s_\gamma : \gamma \in u \rangle$ such that:

- ⊗ (α) $s_\gamma \in J$ for every $\gamma \in u$
- (β) if $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2 \in u$ and $i \in \kappa \setminus (s_{\gamma_1} \cup s_{\gamma_2})$, then $\rho_{\gamma_1}(i) \neq \rho_{\gamma_2}(i)$.

Now for each $\alpha \in w$, the set $t_\alpha := \cup \{s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)} : \varepsilon < \theta\}$ is the union of $\leq \theta$ members of J , but J is θ^+ -complete by assumption (e), hence $t_\alpha \in J$.

Suppose $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$ are from w and $i \in \kappa \setminus (t_{\alpha_1} \cup t_{\alpha_2})$. Can we have $\nu_{\alpha_1}(i) = \nu_{\alpha_2}(i)$? If so, then for every $\varepsilon < \theta$, we have $i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\alpha_1(\varepsilon)} \setminus s_{\alpha_2(\varepsilon)}$ and $\rho_{\eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon)}(i) = \rho_{\eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon)}(i)$, hence necessarily $\eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon) = \eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon)$. As this holds for every $\varepsilon < \theta$, we get $\eta_{\alpha_1} = \eta_{\alpha_2}$. This implies $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$.

So $i \in \kappa \setminus (t_{\alpha_1} \cup t_{\alpha_2}) \wedge \nu_{\alpha_1}(i) = \nu_{\alpha_2}(i) \Rightarrow \alpha_1 = \alpha_2$. Thus $\langle \nu_\alpha : \alpha \in w \rangle$ is free, so we are done. $\square_{3.6}$

(1f.21)

Conclusion 3.8. If clauses (a)-(f) of 3.6 holds and $\mu^\kappa = 2^\mu, \chi \leq 2^\mu$ then $\text{BB}(2^\mu, \mu^+, \chi, J)$.

Proof. By claim 3.6 there is $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality μ^κ which is (μ^+, J) -free. By an assumption, $|\mathcal{F}| = \mu^\kappa = 2^\mu$ hence by 2.10 we get $\text{BB}(2^\mu, \mu^+, \chi, J)$ so we are done. $\square_{3.8}$

A relative of 3.6 is

Claim 3.9. *There is a (μ^+, J_1) -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality λ when*

- ⊗ (a) $\sigma < \theta < \kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu < \lambda$
- (b) (α) J_2 is a σ -complete ideal on θ and
- (β) there are λ pairwise J_2 -distinct members of ${}^\theta \chi$
- (c) $2^\kappa < \mu < \chi < \lambda$ and $2^\kappa < \text{cf}(\lambda)$
- (d) $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow \text{cov}(|\alpha|, \theta^+, \theta^+, \sigma^+) \leq \mu$
- (e) J_1 is a θ^+ -complete ideal on κ
- (f) $\chi < \text{pp}_{J_1}(\mu)$.

Proof:

By clause (f) there is a sequence $\langle \lambda_j : j < \kappa \rangle$ of regular cardinals $\in (2^\kappa, \mu)$ with limit μ such that $\chi^+ = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_{J_1})$ and let $\lambda_i^- = \Sigma \{\lambda_j : j < i\}$ for $i < \kappa$.

By clause (f) and 1.2(c) without loss of generality there is a μ^+ -free sequence $\langle \rho_\gamma : \gamma < \chi \rangle$ of members of $\prod_{j < \kappa} \lambda_j$. Let $\mathcal{P}_i \subseteq [\lambda_i]^\theta$ be a set of cardinality $\leq \mu$ such that

- (*) $_{\mathcal{P}_i}$ for every $u \in [\lambda_i]^\theta$, we can find $\zeta_u \leq \sigma$ and $u_\zeta \in \mathcal{P}_i$ for $\zeta < \zeta_u$ such that $u \subseteq \cup \{u_\zeta : \zeta < \zeta_u\}$;

$\mathcal{P}_i$ exists by clause (d) of the assumption. Let $\mathcal{P} = \cup \{\mathcal{P}_i : i < \kappa\}$, so $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \mu, \mathcal{P} \subseteq {}^\theta [\mu]$.

By clause (b)(β), let $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ with $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\theta \chi$ be such that $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$ implies $\eta_\alpha \neq_{J_2} \eta_\beta$, i.e. $\{\varepsilon < \theta : \eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \eta_\beta(\varepsilon)\} \in J_2$.

Lastly, for each $\alpha < \lambda$, for each $i < \kappa$, we know that $\{\rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}(i) : \varepsilon < \theta\} \in [\lambda_i]^\theta$, hence we can find a sequence $\langle u_{\alpha, \zeta}^i : \zeta < \sigma \rangle$ of members of $\mathcal{P}_i$ such that $\{\rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}(i) : \varepsilon < \theta\} \subseteq \cup \{u_{\alpha, \zeta}^i : \zeta < \sigma\}$.

For each $\alpha < \lambda$ and $i < \kappa$, as J_2 is a σ^+ -complete ideal on θ for some $\zeta_{\alpha, i} < \sigma$, the set $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha, i} := \{\varepsilon < \theta : \rho_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)}(i) \in u_{\alpha, \zeta_{\alpha, i}}^i\}$ belongs to J_2^+ . Let $\mathbf{x}_\alpha := \{(i, \zeta_{\alpha, i}, \text{otp}(\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) \cap u_{\alpha, \zeta}^i)) : i < \kappa \text{ and } \varepsilon \in \mathcal{W}_{\alpha, i} \subseteq \theta\}$.

The number of possible $\mathbf{x}_\alpha$ is at most $\leq 2^\kappa$, but $2^\kappa < \text{cf}(\lambda)$ by clause (c) of the assumption. As we can replace $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ by $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha \in v \rangle$ for any $v \in [\lambda]^\lambda$, without loss of generality for some $\mathbf{x} = \{(i, \zeta_i, \gamma_{i,\varepsilon}) : i < \kappa \text{ and } \varepsilon \in \mathcal{W}_i\}$, we have

$$(*)_0 \quad \mathbf{x}_\alpha = \mathbf{x} \text{ for } \alpha < \lambda.$$

For $\alpha < \lambda$ let $\nu_\alpha \in {}^\kappa \mathcal{P}$ be defined by

$$\odot_1 \quad \nu_\alpha(i) = u_{\alpha, \zeta_{\alpha, i}}^i.$$

Clearly it suffices to show that

$$\odot_2 \quad \bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle \text{ exemplifies the conclusion.}$$

This follows by $(*)_1, (*)_2, (*)_3$ below.

$$(*)_1 \quad \nu_\alpha \in {}^\kappa \mathcal{P} \text{ and } |\mathcal{P}| \leq \mu.$$

[Why? Obviously.]

$$(*)_2 \quad \nu_\alpha \neq \nu_\beta \text{ for } \alpha < \beta < \lambda.$$

[Why? By the proof of $(*)_3$ using $w = \{\alpha, \beta\}$.]

$$(*)_3 \quad \{\nu_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \text{ is } (\mu^+, J)\text{-free.}$$

[Why? Let $w \in [\lambda]^{\leq \mu}$; we shall prove that $\{\nu_\alpha : \alpha \in w\}$ is J_1 -free. Now $u := \cup \{\text{Rang}(\eta_\alpha) : \alpha \in w\} \in [\chi]^{\leq \mu}$, recalling $\varepsilon < \theta \Rightarrow \eta_\alpha(\varepsilon) < \chi$. By the assumption on $\{\rho_\gamma : \gamma < \chi\}$, we can find a sequence $\bar{s}$ such that

$$(\alpha) \quad \bar{s} = \langle s_\gamma : \gamma \in u \rangle \in {}^u(J_1)$$

$$(\beta) \quad \text{if } \gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2 \text{ and } \gamma_1 \in u, \gamma_2 \in u \text{ and } i \in \kappa \setminus s_{\gamma_1} \setminus s_{\gamma_2}, \text{ then } \rho_{\gamma_2}(i) \neq \rho_{\gamma_1}(i).$$

For each $\alpha \in w$, let $t_\alpha := \cup \{s_{\eta_\alpha(\varepsilon)} : \varepsilon < \theta\}$. Since by clause (e) of the assumption the union of $\leq \theta$ members of J_1 which is a θ^+ -complete ideal, clearly $t_\alpha \in J_1$. It suffices to prove that $\langle t_\alpha : \alpha \in w \rangle$ witnesses $\langle \nu_\alpha : \alpha \in w \rangle$ is J_1 -free, so, by the previous sentence, it suffices to prove

$$(*)'_3 \quad \text{assume if } \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2 \text{ are from } w \text{ and } i \in \kappa \setminus t_{\alpha_1} \setminus t_{\alpha_2}, \text{ then } \nu_{\alpha_1}(i) \neq \nu_{\alpha_2}(i).$$

Toward contradiction assume $\nu_{\alpha_1}(i) = \nu_{\alpha_2}(i)$. Recalling the choice of ν_α , i.e. $\odot_1$, this means $u_{\alpha_1, \zeta_{\alpha_1, i}}^i = u_{\alpha_2, \zeta_{\alpha_2, i}}^i$.

As $\mathbf{x}_{\alpha_1} = \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_{\alpha_2}$, see $(*)_0$, clearly $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_1, i} = \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_2, i}$ but we are assuming $u_{\alpha_1, \zeta_{\alpha_1, i}}^i = u_{\alpha_2, \zeta_{\alpha_2, i}}^i$ so by the definition of $\mathbf{x}_{\alpha_1}, \mathbf{x}_{\alpha_2}$ we have $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_1, \zeta_{\alpha_1, i}} = \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_2, \zeta_{\alpha_2, i}} \Rightarrow \eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon) = \eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon)$ so $\{\varepsilon < \theta : \eta_{\alpha_1}(\varepsilon) = \eta_{\alpha_2}(\varepsilon)\} \supseteq \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_1, \zeta_{\alpha_1, i}}$ but $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha_1, \zeta_{\alpha_1, i}} \in J_2^+$ by the choice of $\zeta_{\alpha_1, i}$. So $\neg(\eta_{\alpha_1} \neq_{J_2} \eta_{\alpha_2})$, contradicting the choice of $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$.]

So $(*)'_3$ holds, and hence $(*)_3$ holds. Hence $\odot_2$ holds, so we are done. $\square_{3.9} \quad \langle 1f.23 \rangle$

Observation 3.10. 1) Assume $\lambda > \mu > \kappa = \text{cf}(\mu)$, $\theta < \mu$ and $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\sigma < \mu$, and $\theta = \sup\{\theta_i : i < \sigma\}$ and for each $i < \sigma$, there is a θ_i -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality λ . Then there is a θ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality λ .

1A) If $\kappa = \sigma$ then $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\sigma} < \mu$ suffice.

2) If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ is θ -free, then there is a normal θ -free $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality $|\mathcal{F}|$ - see Definition 1.3(5).

3) If $\delta < \lambda$ and $\langle \lambda_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is increasing with limit λ and there is θ -free $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality λ_i for $i < \delta$ then there is a θ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality λ .

3A) In part (3), if $f \in \mathcal{F}_i \wedge \varepsilon < \kappa$, $f(\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mu$ and $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$ is infinite for $\varepsilon < \kappa$ then without loss of generality $f \in \mathcal{F} \wedge \varepsilon < \kappa \Rightarrow f(\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$.

4) Similarly to (3),(3A) for sequences of length λ_i .

Proof: 1) By coding (separating the proof according to whether $\sigma < \kappa$ or $\sigma \geq \kappa$).

In more detail, let $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ be θ_i -free of cardinality λ , let $\langle \eta_\alpha^i : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ list $\mathcal{F}_i$ with no repetitions, and let $\text{cd} : \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} {}^\sigma\alpha \rightarrow \mu$ be one-to-one.

Case 1: $\sigma < \kappa$.

Let $\eta_\alpha := \langle \text{cd}(\langle \eta_\alpha^i(\varepsilon) : i < \sigma \rangle) : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$, so $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\sigma\mu$, and clearly $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is as required.

Case 2: $\sigma \geq \kappa$.

Let $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ be increasing with limit μ . For each $\alpha < \lambda$, let $f_\alpha : \sigma \times \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ be defined by $f_\alpha(i, \varepsilon) = \min\{j < \kappa : \eta_\alpha^i(\varepsilon) < \mu_j\}$. So the number of possible f_α 's is $\leq \kappa^{\sigma+\kappa} = 2^\sigma < \mu$, hence $\langle \mathcal{U}_f : f \in {}^{\sigma \times \kappa}\kappa \rangle$ is a partition of λ into $\leq 2^\sigma < \mu$ sets, where $\mathcal{U}_f = \{\alpha < \lambda : f_\alpha = f\}$.

By renaming, without loss of generality $\alpha < \lambda \wedge \beta < \lambda \wedge \mathcal{U}_{f_\alpha} \neq \mathcal{U}_{f_\beta} \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(f_\alpha) \cap \text{Rang}(f_\beta) = \emptyset$. Now we can act as in case 1.

1A) Similarly using $\eta_\alpha = \langle \text{cd}(\eta_\alpha^i(\varepsilon) : i \leq \varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ for an appropriate function cd . This is O.K. because $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\sigma} < \mu$; actually $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\sigma} \leq \mu$ suffices.

2) Easy.

3) Let $i(*) = \min\{i : \delta \leq \lambda_i\}$ and let $\lambda_i^- = \bigcup\{\lambda_j : j < i\}$ for $i < \kappa$ let $\langle f_\alpha^i : \alpha < \lambda_i \rangle$ list $\mathcal{F}_i$ with no repetitions, let $\text{cd}_\varepsilon : \mu \times \mu \rightarrow \mu$ be one to one and for $\alpha < \lambda$ let $f_\alpha \in {}^\kappa\mu$ be defined by: if $\alpha \in [\lambda_i^-, \lambda_i)$ and $\varepsilon < \kappa$ then $f'_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \text{cd}_\varepsilon(f_\alpha^i(\varepsilon), f_i^{i(*)}(\varepsilon))$, now check.

3A) Similarly but add: cd_ε maps $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \times \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$ into $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$.

(1f.28)

4) We should add $\text{cd}_\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) < \text{cd}_\varepsilon(\alpha'_1, \alpha'_2)$ iff $(\alpha_2 < \alpha'_2) \vee (\alpha_2 = \alpha'_2 \wedge \alpha_1 < \alpha'_1)$ and $f'_\alpha(\varepsilon) \in [\mu'_i, \mu_i \times \mu_i)$. □3.10

Observation 3.11. There is a $\sup\{\theta_i : i < i(*)\}$ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality 2^μ when:

- (a) $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$
- (b) for each $i < i(*)$ we have (α) or (β) where
 - (α) for some $\chi, \theta_i < \mu < \chi < \lambda$ and $\chi^{<\theta_i>\text{tr}} = \lambda$ (necessarily the supremum is obtained)
 - (β) $\theta_i = \mu^+$ and for some χ and $\sigma < \kappa$ we have $\mu < \chi < \lambda$ and $\chi^\sigma = \lambda$.

Proof: Clearly $i < i(*) \Rightarrow \theta_i \leq \mu^+$. Without loss of generality, $i(*) < \mu$.

[Why? Clearly we can replace $\langle \theta_i : i < i(*) \rangle$ by $\langle \theta_i : i \in u \rangle$ when $u \subseteq i(*)$ and $\sup\{\theta_i : i < i(*)\} = \sup\{\theta_i : i \in u\}$, so without loss of generality $\langle \theta_i : i < i(*) \rangle$ is with no repetitions, and so $i(*) \leq \mu + 1$, and if $i(*) \geq \mu$, we can find u as above of cardinality $< \mu$.]

If for every $i < i(*)$ clause (α) of (b) of the assumption holds then by 3.1 there is θ_i -free $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality λ for each $i < i(*)$ and by 3.10(1) if (α) of (β) the conclusion holds. It holds by 3.6 if (β) of (b) apply for some $i < i(*)$. □3.11

(1f.31)

Claim 3.12. If $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$ and $\lambda = 2^\mu = \chi^+$ and $\text{cf}([\chi]^{<\mu}, \subseteq)$ then

- (a) there is an μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality $2^\mu = \mu^\kappa$

hence

- (b) $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu^+, \theta, \kappa)$ for every $\theta < \mu$.

Remark 3.13. Actually as in [21, Ch.VII,6.1] and the no-hole claim.

Proof. By Definition 1.1 there is an ideal J on κ , a sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ of regular cardinals $< \mu$ such that $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_J)$. So there is a $<_J$ -increasing cofinal sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ of members of $\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$. Let $\bar{e}'_\varepsilon = \langle e_{\varepsilon, \alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ for $\varepsilon < \chi$ be as in 1.26.

Now by induction on $\alpha < \lambda$ we choose $\bar{g}_\alpha = \langle g_{\varepsilon, \alpha} : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle$ and f_α^* such that

- $\boxplus_2$ (a) $g_{\varepsilon, \alpha} \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$
- (b) $f_\alpha^* \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$
- (c) $g_{\varepsilon, \alpha} <_J f_\alpha$
- (d) $f_\gamma <_J g_{\varepsilon, \alpha}$ if $\gamma < \alpha$
- (e) $g_{\varepsilon, \alpha}(i) > \sup\{f_\beta(i) : \beta \in e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}\}$ when $\lambda_i > |e_{\varepsilon, \alpha}|$.

As $(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, <_J)$ is λ -directed we can carry the definition. Now we can prove that for any $u \subseteq \lambda$ the sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle$ is $<_J$ -free by induction on $\text{otp}(u)$, as in the proof of the no-hole claim of [21, Ch.II]. $\square$

Remark 3.14. 0) We may consider a parallel of 3.12 when χ is singular. So assume $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa, \lambda = 2^\mu = \chi^+$ and χ is singular.

- (A) Is there $\text{cf}(\chi)$ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality λ ? Well, if for some $\mu_i, \mu < \mu_1 < \chi$ and $\text{cov}(\chi, \mu_1^+, \mu_1^+, 2) = \chi$, then there is a $\text{cf}(\chi)$ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$ of cardinality κ .

[Why? By 2.12(3), 1.26 Case B, the same proof apply.]

- 1) Note that 2.9 is quoted in $\boxplus_3$ of §0, we may quote 3.12.
- 2) How much partial square on λ suffices: in 3.12? It seems that for cofinality $\geq \kappa$.

Now a variant of 3.1 is:

Claim 3.15. *If $\boxplus$ holds, then $\boxtimes$ holds where:*

- $\boxtimes$ (a) $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa \mu$
- (b) $|\mathcal{F}| = \lambda$
- (c) $\mathcal{F}$ is θ -free
- $\boxplus$ (a) $\mu < \chi < \lambda$
- (b) $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu)$
- (c) θ regular
- (d) $\sigma < \kappa < \theta < \mu$
- (e) J_1 and J_2 are σ^+ -complete ideals on κ, θ respectively
- (f) if $\alpha < \mu$, then $\text{cov}(|\alpha|, \theta^+, \theta^+, \sigma^+) \leq \mu$
- or just
- (f)⁻ if $\alpha < \mu$, then $\mathbf{U}_{J_2}(|\alpha|) \leq \mu$
- (g) there is a set of λ pairwise J_2 -distinct members of ${}^\theta \chi$.

Proof: Combine the proofs of 3.1 and 3.9.

$\square_{3.15}$ (1f.49)

Claim 3.16. *In 3.15:*

1) *If in $\otimes$, clause (g) is exemplified by $\mathcal{F}_2 \subseteq {}^\theta\chi$ which is (σ, J_2) -free, $\sigma > \theta$, then $\mathcal{F}$ is (σ, θ^+, J_2) -free.*

2) *If $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ has cardinality $> \theta$, then $\cup\{\text{Rang}(\nu) : \nu \in \mathcal{F}'\}$ has cardinality $\geq \theta$.*

$\langle 1f.51 \rangle$

Proof: We leave the proof to the reader. $\square_{3.16}$

Claim 3.17. *Assume $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\kappa$, J is a κ -complete ideal on κ and there is no $(\kappa^{+\omega}, J)$ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality $\lambda := 2^\mu$. Then the set $\Theta = \{\theta : \theta = \text{cf}(\theta) < \mu, \theta \neq \kappa \text{ and for some witness } \chi \in (\mu, \lambda) \text{ of cofinality } \theta \text{ we have } \text{pp}_J(\chi) =^+ \lambda \text{ for some } \theta\text{-complete ideal } J \text{ on } \theta\}$ is a singleton or of the form $\{\theta, \theta^+\}$.*

Remark 3.18. This is intended to help in §5 to deal with R -modules when $\text{sp}(R)$ has at least 3 (or four!) members.

Proof: Let (θ_1, χ_1, J_1) be such that $\theta_1 \in \Theta$ and (χ_1, J) a witness for $\theta_1 \in \Theta$ and χ_1 is minimal under those conditions.

If $\theta \in \Theta \wedge \theta_1 < \kappa$, note that $\chi_1 < \lambda \leq \chi^{\theta_1} \leq \lambda$ hence we get a contradiction by 3.6 to an assumption; so we can assume $\theta_1 > \kappa$. Also by the choice of χ_1 as minimal, we have:

$$(*) \quad \alpha < \chi_1 \Rightarrow \text{cov}(|\alpha|, \mu^+, \mu^+, \kappa^+) < \chi.$$

If $\Theta = \{\theta_1\}$ or $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_1^+\}$, we are done; otherwise let (θ_2, χ_2, J_2) be such that $\theta_2 \in \Theta \setminus \{\theta_1, \theta_1^+\}$ and (χ_2, J_2) witness that $\theta_2 \in \Theta$, and χ_2 is minimal under those requirements.

Now

(*) there is a θ_1^{++} -free set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^{\theta_1}(\chi_1)$ of pairwise J_1 -distinct elements.

[Why? As $\theta_2 > \theta_1$, then necessarily $\theta_2 > \theta_1^+$, hence such an $\mathcal{F}$ exists by 3.15 with $\chi_1, \chi_2, \kappa, \theta_1, \theta_2, J_1, J_2$ here standing for $\mu, \chi, \sigma, \kappa, \theta, J_1, J_2$. So assume $\theta_2 < \theta_1$; hence by 3.9 with $\chi_1, \chi_2, \kappa, \theta_1, \theta_2, J_1, J_2$ here standing for $\mu, \chi, \sigma, \kappa, \theta, J_1, J_2$ there, we are done.]

$\langle 1f.53 \rangle$

Now by (*) we can apply 3.5, case(c) and we are done. $\square_{3.17}$

4. PROPAGATING $\text{OBB}_\sigma(\bar{C})$ DOWN BY PCF

We deal here with the ordered black box, OBB and prove in ZFC that many cases occur.

Definition 4.1. 1) For a partial order J , a sequence $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ and an ideal I on S , let $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$ mean that there exists a sequence $\langle t_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ with $t_\delta \in J$ such that: if $f : \bigcup_{\delta \in S} C_\delta \rightarrow J$, then $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta)\} \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } I$.

2) If $\sup(S) = \sup(\bigcup_{\delta \in S} C_\delta)$ is a regular uncountable cardinal and I is the non-stationary ideal restricted to S , then we may omit I .

3) If $J = (\theta, <)$, we may write θ instead of J .

4) $\text{OBB}_J^+(\bar{C}, I)$ is defined as in part (1) but we demand $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f(\alpha) \leq t_\delta)\} = S \text{ mod } I$.

Note that we can use only I, J and $\lambda(\bar{C})$, see below which are regular cardinals.

Notation 4.2. Let $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$, $S = S(\bar{C})$ and $\text{Dom}(\bar{C}) = \bigcup \{C_\delta : \delta \in S\}$.

1) We may write $\kappa = \kappa(\bar{C})$ when $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \text{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$.

2) We may write $\lambda = \lambda(\bar{C})$ when $S \subseteq \lambda$ is a stationary subset of the regular uncountable cardinal λ and $[\delta \in S \Rightarrow C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)]$.

3) We may write $\mu = \mu(\bar{C})$ when $\mu = \sup \bigcup \{C_\delta : \delta \in S\}$ is $< |S(\bar{C})|$.

4) We say $\bar{C}$ is tree-like when $\alpha \in C_{\delta_1} \cap C_{\delta_2} \Rightarrow C_{\delta_1} \cap \alpha = C_{\delta_2} \cap \alpha$.

A (trivial) starting point is

Observation 4.3. 1) If $\lambda = \lambda(\bar{C})$ is (well-defined and) regular uncountable and I is the non-stationary ideal restricted to S (which is a stationary subset of λ), see Definition 4.2(2), then $\text{OBB}_\lambda(\bar{C}, I)$ and moreover $\text{OBB}_\lambda^+(\bar{C}, I)$.

2) If $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$ as exemplified by $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ and $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta)$ and J is a θ -directed partial order and $I_t^* := \{\bigcup \{A_i : i < i(*)\} : i(*) < \theta \text{ and for each } i < \theta \text{ for some } f_i : \bigcup \{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \rightarrow J \text{ we have } A_i = \{\delta \in S : \neg(\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta)\}\}$ then $\text{OBB}_J^+(\bar{C}, I_t^*)$ and I_t^* is a θ -complete ideal on $\lambda(\bar{C})$.

3) If $\text{OBB}_J^+(\bar{C}, I)$ and $S_1 \in I^+$ then $\text{OBB}_J^+(\bar{C}, I + (S \setminus S_1))$, in fact for $J, S, \bar{C}, I$ as in 4.1, $\text{OBB}_J^+(\bar{C}, I)$ iff $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I + (S \setminus S_1))$ for every $S_1 \in I^+$.

Proof: 1) Let $S = S(\bar{C})$. We define $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ by letting $t_\delta = \delta$.

Now let $f : \bigcup \{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \rightarrow \lambda$ but $\bigcup \{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \subseteq \lambda$ so let $f^+ \supseteq f$ be such that $f^+ : \lambda \rightarrow \lambda$ (we usually below use just any such f^+).

So $E = \{\delta < \lambda : \text{for every } \alpha < \delta \text{ we have } f^+(\alpha) < \delta\}$, clearly it is a club of λ and for every $\delta \in S \cap E$ we have $\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow \alpha < \delta \Rightarrow f(\alpha) < \delta$.

As $S \cap E$ is stationary, we are done.

2) Obviously, $I_t^* - \mathcal{P}(S)$ is closed under subsets, and as θ is infinite regular, it is closed under union of $< \theta$ members, clearly $\text{OBB}_J^+(\bar{C}, I_t^*)$ hold by the definition 4.1 provided that we show $S \notin I_t^*$. So assume $i(*) < \theta$, $f_i : \bigcup \{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \rightarrow J$ and $A_i := \{\delta \in S : \neg(\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta)\}$ and we should prove $S \neq \bigcup \{A_i : i < i(*)\}$. Choose $f : \bigcup \{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \rightarrow J$ by: $f(\alpha)$ is any $\leq_J$ -upper bound of $\{f_i(\alpha) : i < i(*)\}$, exist as J is θ -directed. So we know that $A := \{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f(\alpha)) \leq t_\delta\}$, so $A \in I^+$ as $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$ is assumed, so necessarily $A \neq \emptyset$ by the definition of A, A_i , so we are done.

3) Easy.

□_{4.3} (j.44)

The main case in 4.4 is: each J_i is a regular cardinal $> i^*$.

Lemma 4.4. *If clauses (a)-(f) below hold, then for some $\mathcal{U} \in I_*^+$, for every $i \in \mathcal{U}$, we have $\text{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)$, where:*

- (a) $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$ such that $S = S(\bar{C})$, $\kappa = \kappa(\bar{C})$ or just $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \text{otp}(C_\delta) \leq \kappa$
- (b) I is an $|i^*|^+$ -complete ideal on S
- (c) $\bar{J} = \langle J_i : i < i^* \rangle$
- (d) J_i is a partial order such that $J_i \models (\forall s)(\exists t)(s < t)$
- (e) I_* is an ideal on i^*
- (f) (α) J is a partial order
- (β) $\bar{g} = \langle g_t : t \in J \rangle$
- (γ) $g_t \in \prod_{i < i^*} J_i$ for $t \in J$
- (δ) $\{g_t : t \in J\}$ is cofinal in $J_* = (\prod_{i < i^*} J_i, \leq_{I_*})$, that is, the partial

order $\leq_{I_*}$ on $\prod_{i < i^*} J_i$ is defined by $g' \leq_{I_*} g''$ iff

$$\{i < i^* : g'(i) \leq_{J_i} g''(i)\} = i^* \text{ mod } I_*$$

- (ε) $\bar{g}$ is increasing, i.e., $s \leq_J t \Rightarrow g_s \leq_{I_*} g_t$,
- (g) one of the following² possibilities holds:

Pos (A): (α) I_* is κ^+ -complete or just

(α)' I_* is $|C_\delta|^+$ -complete for every $\delta \in S$

Pos (B): (α) $\bar{C}$ is tree like

(β) J_i is κ -directed

(γ) if $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \in I_*$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing for $\varepsilon < \kappa$ then $i^* \setminus \bigcup \{\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\} \notin I_*$

Pos (C): there is $\mathbf{F} : \prod_{i < i^*} J_i \rightarrow J$ satisfying $f \leq_{I_*} g_{\mathbf{F}(f)}$ and if $f_\varepsilon \in \prod_{i < i^*} J_i$ and $\mathbf{F}(f_\varepsilon) \leq_J t$ for $\varepsilon < \kappa$, then $\{i < i^* : f_\varepsilon(i) \leq_{J_i} g_t(i) \text{ for every } \varepsilon < \kappa\} \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } I_*$

Pos (D): Clauses (α), (β) as in Pos (B), each J_i is κ -directed and if $r_\varepsilon <_J r_\zeta \leq_J t$ for $\varepsilon < \zeta < \kappa$, then $\{i < i^* : g_{r_\varepsilon}(i) \leq_{J_i} g_t(i) \text{ for every } \varepsilon < \kappa\} \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } I_*$

Pos (E): Clause (α) as in Pos (B) and $\mathbf{F}_\varepsilon : {}^{\varepsilon+1}(\prod_{i < i^*} J_i) \rightarrow J$ for $\varepsilon < \kappa$ such that if $f_\zeta \in \prod_{i < i^*} J_i$ and $t_\zeta = \mathbf{F}_\zeta(\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \zeta \rangle)$ and $t_\zeta \leq_J t$ for $\zeta < \kappa$ then $\{i < i^* : (\forall \varepsilon < \kappa)(f_\varepsilon(i) \leq_{J_i} g_t(i))\} \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } I_*$ and $f_\zeta \leq_{J_*} g_{t_\zeta}$.

Remark 4.5. 1) In Pos(A) of 4.4, when clause (α) holds we get $\mathcal{U} = i^* \text{ mod } I$.

Proof:

Let $B = \bigcup \{C_\delta : \delta \in S(\bar{C})\}$.

Let $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ witness $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$. For each $i < i^*$, we consider $\bar{s}^i := \langle g_{t_\delta}(i) : \delta \in S \rangle \in {}^S(J_i)$. Let

(*)₁ $\mathcal{U}_0 := \{i < i^* : \bar{s}^i \text{ is a witness for } \text{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)\}$.

It suffices to prove

(*)₂ $\mathcal{U}_0 \notin I$

²we may label this (f)(ζ) rather than (g), but as it is much bigger we prefer the present form

[Why? Obviously.]

Now for each $i \in \mathcal{U}_1 := i^* \setminus \mathcal{U}_0$ let $f_i : B \rightarrow J_i$ exemplify that $\bar{s}^i$ is not a witness for $\text{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)$, i.e.,

$$(*)_3 \text{ if } i \in i^* \setminus \mathcal{U}_0 \text{ then } W_i = \emptyset \text{ mod } I \text{ where } W_i := \{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \leq_{J_i} s_\delta^i)\}.$$

If $i \in \mathcal{U}_0$, choose any $f_i : B \rightarrow J_i$.

Now

$$(*)_4 \quad W := \cup\{W_i : i \in \mathcal{U}_1\} \in I.$$

[Why? By clause (b) of the assumption, the ideal I is $|i^*|^+$ -complete.]

Now we choose for each $\alpha \in B$ a function h_α as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_5 \quad (a) \quad & h_\alpha \in \prod_{i < i^*} J_i \\ (b) \quad & i < i^* \Rightarrow f_i(\alpha) \leq_{J_i} h_\alpha(i) \\ (c) \quad & \text{if } (\bar{C} \text{ is tree-like and each } J_i \text{ is } \kappa\text{-directed}), \\ & \text{then } h_\alpha(i) \text{ is a common } \leq_{J_i}\text{-upper bound of } \{f_\beta(i)\} \cup \{h_\beta(i) : \\ & \text{there is } \delta \in S \text{ such that } \alpha \in C_\delta \wedge \beta \in C_\delta \cap \alpha\}, \\ & \text{so } \langle h_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in C_\delta \rangle \text{ is } \leq_{J_i}\text{-increasing for each } \delta \in S. \end{aligned}$$

[Why does such an h_α exist? If the assumption of $(*)_5(c)$ fails, we let $h_\alpha(i) = f_i(\alpha)$. If the assumption of $(*)_5(c)$ holds, then (for $\alpha \in B, i < i^*$) the set $\{f_\beta(i) : \beta = \alpha \text{ or } (\exists \delta \in S)(\alpha \in C_\delta \wedge \beta \in C_\delta \cap \alpha)\}$ has cardinality $< \kappa$ because $\bar{C}$ is tree-like and has a common $\leq_{J_i}$ -upper bound since J_i is κ -directed and let $h_\alpha(i)$ be any such bound.]

So for $\alpha \in B$, we have $h_\alpha \in \prod_{i < i^*} J_i$, and hence by clause $(f)(\delta)$ of the assumption,

we can choose $s_\alpha \in J$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_6 \quad (a) \quad & h_\alpha \leq_{I_*} g_{s_\alpha}, \text{ i.e.,} \\ & \mathcal{U}_\alpha^0 := \{i < i^* : \neg(h_\alpha(i) \leq_{J_i} g_{s_\alpha}(i))\} \in I_* \\ (b) \quad & \text{in Pos}(C), s_\alpha := \mathbf{F}(h_\alpha) \text{ hence } h_\alpha \leq_{I_*} g_{s_\alpha} \\ (c) \quad & \text{in Pos}(E), \text{ if } \alpha \in C \text{ letting } \langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \zeta \rangle \text{ list } C_\delta \cap (\alpha + 1), \\ & \text{for any } \delta \in S \text{ such that } \alpha \in C_\delta, \text{ we have} \\ & s_\alpha = \mathbf{F}_\zeta(\langle h_{\alpha_\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \zeta \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

So $\alpha \mapsto s_\alpha$ is a function from $B = \bigcup_{\delta \in S} C_\delta$ to J , but $\langle t_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ was chosen

exemplifying $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$, hence

$$(*)_7 \quad W_* := \{\delta \in S : \text{if } \alpha \in C_\delta, \text{ then } s_\alpha \leq_J t_\delta\} \text{ belongs to } I^+.$$

Recalling that $W = \cup\{W_i : i \in \mathcal{U}\} \in I$, clearly $W_* \not\subseteq W$, hence we can choose $\delta(*)$ such that

$$(*)_8 \quad \delta(*) \in W_* \setminus W.$$

Now

$$(*)_9 \text{ if } \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}, \text{ then } \mathcal{U}_{\delta(*), \alpha}^1 := \{i < i^* : h_\alpha(i) \leq_{J_i} g_{t_{\delta(*)}}(i)\} = i^* \text{ mod } I_*.$$

[Why? Because for each $\alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}$ in the partial order $J_* := (\prod_{i < i^*} J_i, \leq_{I_*})$, we have

$h_\alpha \leq_{I_*} g_{s_\alpha}$ by the choice of s_α , i.e. by $(*)_6$. Also $s_\alpha \leq_J t_{\delta(*)}$ because $\delta(*) \in W_*$ see $(*)_7 + (*)_8$ hence $g_{s_\alpha} \leq_{I_*} g_{t_{\delta(*)}}$ by clause $(f)(\varepsilon)$ of the assumption and by clause $(f)(\delta)$ this means that $\{i < i^* : g_{s_\alpha}(i) \leq_{J_i} g_{t_{\delta(*)}}(i)\} = i^* \text{ mod } I_*$. Together, the last two sentences gives $(*)_9$.]

Case 1: Pos A:

Now I_* is κ^+ -complete (or just $|C_{\delta(*)}|^+$ -complete), by clause (α) (or clause $(\alpha)'$) of $\text{Pos}(A)$ so necessarily (by $(*)_9$).

$$(*)_{10} \quad \mathcal{U}_1 := \bigcap_{\alpha \in C_\delta} \mathcal{U}_{\delta(*),\alpha}^1 = i^* \text{ mod } I_*.$$

Now if $i \in \mathcal{U}_1 \setminus \mathcal{U}_0$, then $f_i : B \rightarrow J_i$ exemplifies that $\bar{s}^i$ is not a witness for $\text{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)$ and W_i is well-defined and a subset of W , hence $\delta(*) \notin W_i$; hence for some $\alpha_i \in C_\delta$, we have $\neg(f_i(\alpha_i) \leq_{J_i} s_\delta^i)$. But this means that $i \notin \mathcal{U}_{\delta(*),\alpha_i}^1$ which by $(*)_{10}$ implies $i \notin \mathcal{U}_1$, a contradiction. We conclude

$$(*)_{11} \quad \mathcal{U}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0.$$

So by $(*)_{10} + (*)_{11}$, we have proved $(*)_2$ which, as noted above, is sufficient for proving the Lemma 4.4 when $\text{Pos}(A)$ hold, even give more.

Case 2: $\text{Pos}(B)$

[Why? Note that by clauses $(\beta), (\gamma)$ of $\text{Pos}(B)$, clause (b) of $(*)_5$ apply. So for each $i < i^*$, by $(*)_5(b)$ the sequence $\langle h_\alpha(i) : \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)} \rangle$ is $\leq_{J_i}$ -increasing. Hence by $(*)_5(b)$ the sequence $\langle s \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\delta(*),\alpha}^1 : \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)} \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -decreasing and clearly $\mathcal{U}_0 = \bigcap \{\mathcal{U}_{\delta(*),\alpha}^1 : \alpha \in c_\delta\}$.]

Now $(*)_9$ holds as it uses only clause (α) of $\text{Pos}(A)$ which holds.

By $(*)_9$ we have $\mathcal{U}_{\delta(*),\alpha(*)}^1 = i^* \text{ mod } I_*$ so $\alpha \in C_{\delta(*)} \Rightarrow c^* \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\delta(*),\alpha}^1 \in I_*$ hence by $\leq_{J_i} g_{t_{\delta(*)}}(i) \Rightarrow f_i(\alpha) \cap \{\mathcal{U}_{\delta(*),\alpha}^1 : \alpha \in C_\delta\} \in I_*^+$ so we are done.

Case 3: $\text{Pos}(C)$

This is easier.

Case 4: $\text{Pos}(D)$

By clauses $(\beta), (\gamma)$ of $\text{Pos}(D)$ the assumption of clause (b) of $(*)_5$ holds hence its conclusion. Also $(*)_9$ holds by clause (α) of $\text{Pos}(D)$. Now apply clause (δ) there.

Case 5: $\text{Pos}(E)$

Easy.

□_{4.4}

⟨j.45⟩

Conclusion 4.6. Assume that $\mu > \text{cf}(\mu) = \sigma, \mu > \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) \neq \sigma$, and J is an ideal on σ which is σ -complete (or just $\sigma > \kappa \Rightarrow J$ is κ^+ -complete).

1) If $\mu < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) < \text{pp}_J^+(\mu)$, $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ is stationary, and $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is a strict (λ, κ) -ladder system, tree-like when $\sigma > \kappa$, then for unboundedly many regular $\theta < \mu$, we have $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$.

2) Assume that for each regular $\lambda \in (\mu, \text{pp}_J^+(\mu))$, $S_\lambda \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ is stationary and $\bar{C}^\lambda = \langle C_\delta^\lambda : \delta \in S_\lambda \rangle$ is a strict (λ, κ) -ladder system, κ/C which is tree like when $\sigma > \kappa$. Then some $\mu_0 < \mu$, for every regular $\theta \in (\mu_0, \mu)$, for some λ we have $\mu < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) < \text{pp}_J^+(\mu)$ and $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C}^\lambda)$.

Proof: 1) By the “No hole Conclusion”, [21, ChII,2.3,pg.53] there is a sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ of regular cardinals such that $\mu = \lim_J \langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ and $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \sigma} \lambda_i, <_J)$; let $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ exemplify this. We shall apply 4.4, $\text{Pos}(A)$ if $\sigma > \kappa$, $\text{Pos}(B)$ if $\sigma < \kappa$ with $\sigma, J_\lambda^{\text{nst}} \upharpoonright S, J_{\lambda_i}^{\text{bd}}$, (for $i < \sigma$), $J, (\lambda, <), \langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ here standing for i^*, I, J_i (for $i < i^*$), $I_*, J, \langle g_t : t \in J \rangle$ there.

Note that clause (a) of the assumption of 4.4 says that $\text{OBB}_\lambda(\bar{C}, J_\lambda^{\text{nst}} \upharpoonright S)$, it holds by Observation 4.3(1); the other assumptions of Lemma 4.4 are also obvious. So its conclusion holds, i.e., $\{i : \text{OBB}_{\lambda_i}(\bar{C})\}$ belongs to J^+ .

Therefore, since $\mu = \lim_J \langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma \rangle$, clearly $\mu = \sup\{\lambda_i : i < \sigma \text{ and } \text{OBB}_{\lambda_i}(\bar{C})\}$ as required.

2) Similarly.

□_{4.6} (j.45.2)

Note that useful in combination with 4.6

Observation 4.7. 1) In 4.6, if $\mu < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) < \text{pp}_J(\mu)$, then we can find a stationary $S \subseteq S_\kappa^\lambda$ such that $S \in \check{I}[\lambda]$ and for any such S there are a club E of λ and a strict (λ, κ) -ladder system $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \cap E \rangle$ which is μ^+ -free.

2) We can demand $\bar{C}$ is tree-like if $\lambda < \mu^{<\sigma>\text{tr}}$.

Proof. By [20, §1] there is such S by a strict S -ladder system $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ which is tree-like. Combining with 1.2(c) we can get a strict S -ladder system which is μ^+ -free.

2) Use [24, §1] and 1.2(c). □

Conclusion 4.8. Assume $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\sigma, \kappa} = \text{cf}(\kappa) \in \text{Reg} \cap \mu \setminus \{\sigma\}$ and for every $\lambda \in \text{Reg} \cap (2^\mu)^+ \setminus \mu$ the sequence $\bar{C}_\lambda := \langle C_\delta^\lambda : \delta \in S_\lambda \rangle$ is a (λ, κ) -ladder system.

Assume $\kappa < \sigma$ or $\sigma < \kappa < \mu$ and each $\bar{C}_\lambda$ is tree-like.

1) For every large enough regular $\theta < \mu$ we have $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C}_\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \text{Reg} \cap (\mu, 2^\mu]$.

2) If $\kappa < \sigma$ and $\lambda \in [\mu, 2^\mu] \cap \text{Reg}$ then for arbitrarily large $\theta \in \text{Reg} \cap \mu$ we have $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C}_\lambda)$.

Proof. By 4.6. □_{4.6}

Question 4.9. 1) On entangled linear orders see [22], existence is proved in some μ^+ , but it remains open whether we can demand $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0}$; is the present work helpful?

2) If $\mathcal{P} \subseteq {}^\omega \lambda, \mu \leq \lambda \leq 2^\mu$ and $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \lambda$, can we partition $\mathcal{P}$ to “few” $\aleph_\omega$ -free sets? What if we add $2^\mu = \lambda = 2^{<\lambda} = \text{cf}(\lambda)$?

* * *

Claim 4.10. 1) Assume

- (a) $\text{OBB}_J^+(\bar{C}, I)$ and³ $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > |C_\delta|$ for $\delta \in S := S(\bar{C})$
- (b) I is $(2^{i^*})^+$ -complete
- (c) $\bar{J} = \langle J_i : i < i^* \rangle$
- (d) J_i is a partial order such that $J_i \models \forall s \exists t (s < t)$
- (e) I_* is a κ -complete ideal on i^*
- (f) (α) J is a partial order
 - (β) $\bar{g} = \langle g_t : t \in J \rangle$
 - (γ) $g_t \in \prod_{i < i^*} J_i$
 - (δ) $s <_J t \Rightarrow g_s <_{I_*} g_t$
- (g) if $g^\varepsilon \in \prod_{i < i^*} J_i$ for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^* < \kappa$, then for some $A \in I_*^+$ and for each $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^*$, for some $t \in J$, we have $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^* \Rightarrow g^\varepsilon \upharpoonright A <_{I_* \upharpoonright A} g_t \upharpoonright A$

³using C_δ 's of constant cardinality is a loss but only if κ is a limit cardinal

- (h) in the following game $\mathcal{D}$ the non-empty player has a winning strategy, a play last κ or just $\sup\{\text{otp}(C_\delta) : \delta \in S\}$. In the i -th move the empty player chooses a function $f_i \in \prod_i J_i$ and the non-empty player chooses $t_i \in J$. In the end, the non-empty player wins the play when for every $\delta \in S$ there is $i < i^*$ such that $i < \text{otp}(C_\delta) \Rightarrow f_i(i) \leq_{J_i} g_{t_i}(i)$.

Then $\{i < i^* : \text{OBB}_{J_i}^+(\bar{C}, I)\} \neq \emptyset \bmod I_*$.

2) If clause (a) above holds for $I_* \restriction A_0$ for any $A_0 \in I_*^+$, then we can strengthen the conclusion to $\{i < i^* : \text{OBB}_{J_i}(\bar{C}, I)\} = i^* \bmod I_*$.

Remark 4.11. (2009.06.09) 1) Revise the proof using clause (h) instead of clause (b).

2) In 4.9 use “a class of cardinals μ^+ ” instead “some” Old 09.5.16

[SAHARON: (09/4/02) - Rethink, maybe can prove upgrading OBB^1 to OBB^4 which is better.]

2) If in addition I is θ -complete, $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta)$ and $(\forall \alpha < \theta)(|\alpha|^{i^*} < \theta)$, then $\{i < i^* : \text{OBB}_{J_i}^5(\bar{C}, I') \text{ for some } \theta\text{-complete } I' \supseteq I\} = i^* \bmod I_*$.

Proof: 1) We start to repeat the proof of 4.4. Let $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ witness $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$.

Let $\mathcal{U}_1 = \{i < i^* : \bar{s}^i := \langle g_{t_\delta}(i) : \delta \in S \rangle \in {}^S(J_i) \text{ is a witness for } \text{OBB}_{J_i}^+(\bar{C}, I)\}$ and for $i < i^*$ let $f_i : \text{Dom}(\bar{C}) \rightarrow J_i$ exemplifies $\neg \text{OBB}_{J_i}^\ell(\bar{C}, I)$ if $i \in \mathcal{U}_1$; so $\langle f_i(\alpha) : i < i^* \rangle \in \prod_{i < i^*} J_i$ for $\alpha \in \text{Dom}(\bar{C})$. So $i \in \mathcal{U}_1 \Rightarrow W^i := \{\delta \in S : (\exists \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \not\leq_{J_i} g_{t_\delta}(i))\} = S \bmod I$.

Toward contradiction assume that $\mathcal{U}_1 = i^* \bmod I_*$.

For each $A \in I_*^+$ we choose $f_A : \text{Dom}(\bar{C}) \rightarrow J$ such that

- (*)₁ for $\alpha \in \text{Dom}(\bar{C})$, if there is $t \in J$ such that $\langle f_i(\alpha) : i \in A \rangle <_{I_* \restriction A} (g_{t \restriction A})$, then $\langle f_i(\alpha) : i \in A \rangle <_{I_* \restriction A} g_{f_A(\alpha)}$.

For each $A \in I_*^+$, we know that $W_A := \{\delta \in S : \text{for every } \alpha \in C_\delta, f_A(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta\} = S \bmod I$.

But the ideal I is $(2^{i^*})^+$ -complete by clause (b) of the assumption, hence $W := \cap \{W_A : A \in I_*^+\} \cap \{W^i : i \in \mathcal{U}_1\} = S \bmod I$. Now for any $\delta \in W$, consider $\langle \langle f_i(\alpha) : i < i^* \rangle : \alpha \in C_\delta \rangle$; it is a sequence of $< \kappa$ members of ${}^{i^*}J$; hence by clause (f) for some $A \in I_*^+$, each $\langle f_i(\alpha) : i < i^* \rangle \restriction A$ has a bound belonging to the set $\{g_t \restriction A : t \in J\}$ in $(\prod_{i \in A} J_i, <_{I_* \restriction A})$.

So $\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow \langle f_i(\alpha) : i \in A \rangle <_{I_* \restriction A} g_{f_A(\alpha)}$. But $\delta \in W \subseteq W_A$, hence $f_A(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta$, and hence $g_{f_A(\alpha)} <_{I_*} g_{t_\delta}$. So $\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow \langle f_i(\alpha) : i \in A \rangle <_{I_* \restriction A} g_{f_A(\alpha)} <_{I_*} g_{t_\delta}$. However, I_* is κ -complete by clause (e) and $|C_\delta| < \kappa$, hence $B := \{i \in A : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) <_{J_i} g_{t_\delta}(i))\} = A \bmod I_*$.

As $\mathcal{U}_1 = S \bmod D_*$ and $A \in I_*^+, \mathcal{U}_1 \cap A \in I_*^+$, so $\mathcal{U}_1 \cap A \neq \emptyset$. But letting $i \in A$, we get a contradiction to the assumption that f_i exemplifies $\neg \text{OBB}_{J_i}^+(\bar{C}, I)$, and W is thin enough, i.e., $W \subseteq W^i$ for $i \in \mathcal{U}_1$.

2) Easy.

□_{4.10}

Claim 4.12. If $\lambda_n = \text{cf}(2^{\mu_n})$, $2^{\mu_n} < \mu_{n+1}$ for $n < \omega$ and $(\forall \alpha < 2^{\mu_n})(|\alpha|^{\aleph_1} < 2^{\mu_n})$, $\chi < \mu = \Sigma\{\mu_n : n < \omega\} \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$, $\lambda \in \text{pcf}\{\lambda_n : n < \omega\} \setminus \mu$ then $BB(\lambda, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \chi, J_{\omega_1 * \omega})$.

2) Similarly replacing ω by σ .

Remark 4.13. 1) On $J_{\omega_1 * \omega}$ see 1.4(2).

2) If $\{\mu : (\forall \alpha < 2^\mu)(|\alpha|^{\aleph_1} < 2^\mu)\}$ is uncountable the claim apply.

Proof. 1) By part (2).

2) Note

(*)₁ without loss of generality $\chi = \chi^{\sigma^+}$

(*)₂ let $\langle f_\alpha^i : \alpha < 2^{\mu_i} \rangle$ list $^{(\mu_i)}\chi$

(*)₃ choose a sequence $\bar{g}_i = \langle g_\beta^i : \beta < 2^{\mu_i} \rangle$ of members of $^{\mu_i}(\sigma\chi)$ such that if $\beta < \lambda_i$ and $\gamma_j < \beta$ for $j < \sigma$ then for some $\varepsilon < \mu_i$ we have $g'_\beta(\varepsilon) = \langle f_{\gamma_j}^i(\varepsilon) : j < \sigma \rangle$.

[Why? As $\alpha < 2^{\mu_i} \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\sigma < 2^{\mu_i}$ and $\chi = \chi^\sigma$ by renaming it suffices to prove: if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq ^{(\mu_i)}\chi$ has cardinality $< 2^{\mu_i}$ then for some $g \in ^{\mu_i}\chi$ we have $(\forall f \in \mathcal{F})(\exists \varepsilon < \mu_i)(f(i) = g(i))$.

As $\mu_i \in \mathbf{C}_\sigma$ this is as in [26] or §2 here; that is we can find $\bar{f} = \langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu_i \rangle$ exemplifying $\text{Sep}(\mu_i, \chi, (2^\chi)^+)$ which holds by 2.5(d). Now choose $g \in ^{(\mu_i)}\chi \setminus \cup \{\text{Sol}_\varrho : \varrho \in \mathcal{F}\}$, where $\text{Sol}_\varrho := \{\nu \in \chi : \text{if } \varepsilon < \mu_i \text{ then } \varrho(\varepsilon) = f_\varepsilon(\nu)\}$ as in (*)₀ in the proof of 2.2; there is such g as $|\text{Sol}_\varrho| < (2^\chi)^+$ for every $\varrho \in ^{(\mu_i)}\theta$.]

(*)₄ without loss of generality $\lambda := \text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \sigma} \lambda_i, <_{J_\sigma^{\text{bd}}})$ is well defined.

[Why? By the pcf theorem there is an unbounded $u \subseteq \sigma$ such that $\text{tcf}(\prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i, <_{J_u^{\text{bd}}})$ is well defined and rename.]

(*)₅ if $\lambda < 2^\mu$ then we get the conclusion.

[Why? By Definition 1.1 and 1.2(c) there is a μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\sigma\mu$ of cardinality λ . Hence by 1.9(2) for any stationary $S \subseteq S_{\sigma^+}^\lambda$ we can choose an S -ladder system $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ which is $(\mu^+, J_{\sigma^+ * \sigma})$ -free. So by 4.4, $\text{OBB}(\bar{C}, \lambda_i)$ for every $i < \sigma$ large enough. By (*)₃ and 4.15 we can get the conclusion.]

(*)₆ if $\lambda = 2^\mu$ then we get the conclusion.

[Why? Now by ??, ??(1) we can find stationary $S \subseteq S_{\sigma^+}^\lambda$ and a $(\sigma^{+(\sigma+1)}, J_{\sigma^+ * \sigma})$ -free S -ladder system. We finish similarly to (*)₅ but here we use $\alpha < 2^{\mu_i} \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\sigma^+} < 2^{\mu_i}$.] $\square$

Remark 4.14. (HERE?)

On the remark to 4.10.

Theorem 4.15. 1) We have $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, \theta, \kappa)$ when:

- (a) $\text{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C}, I)$, I is μ^+ -complete
- (b) $\kappa(\bar{C}) = \kappa$
- (c) $\chi = \text{cf}(2^\mu)$ and $\theta < \mu$
- (d) $\alpha < 2^\mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\kappa < 2^\mu$
- (e) $\text{Sep}(\mu, \theta)$, see Definition 2.1(2).

2) Moreover in part (1) we get $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, (2^\mu, \theta), \kappa)$.

3) Similarly replacing (d) by

(d)' $\bar{C}$ is tree-like and $\alpha < 2^\mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\kappa>\text{tr}} < 2^\mu$.

Proof. 1) By (2).

2),3) Let $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S(\bar{C}) \rangle \in S(\bar{C})$ witness $\text{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C})$.

We now repeat the proof of [26, 1.10] or of 2.2 here using t_δ instead of δ for $\delta \in S$. $\square_{4.15}$

Discussion 4.16. On 4.15:

- 1) We use the obvious decomposition $\langle \mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \chi \rangle$ of ${}^\mu\theta$. There may be others.
- 2) We may replace “ $\chi = \text{cf}(2^\mu)$ ” by $\chi = \lambda = \min\{\lambda : 2^\lambda > 2^\mu\}$ as in §2.
- 3) We may phrase the condition on $\mathbf{F} : {}^\mu\theta \rightarrow \Upsilon$ not only when $\Upsilon = \text{cf}(\theta^\mu)$.
- 4) Like (3) but for our specific problem: $\text{Hom}(G, \mathbb{Z}) = \{0\}$.

* * *

We look at another way to get cases of OBB. Recall the definition of $\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \mathfrak{d}_\theta}^{<\sigma}$ from Matet-Roslanowski-Shelah [7, 1.1] which proves this number can; i.e. consistently, have cofinality $\aleph_0$ and be $< \mathfrak{d}_\theta$; not used in the rest of the paper.

Definition 4.17. Assume $\mu \geq \theta = \text{cf}(\theta) \geq \sigma$ and I an ideal on μ (so by our notation determine μ).

- 1) Let $\mathfrak{d}_{I, \theta, <\sigma}$ be $\min\{|\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\mu\theta \text{ has no } (I, \theta)\text{-bound}\}$ where
- 2) We say that $g \in {}^\theta\theta$ is a (I, σ) -bound of $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\mu\theta$ when for any $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of cardinality $< \sigma$ for I^+ -many $\varepsilon < \mu$ we have $(\forall f \in \mathcal{F}')(f(\varepsilon) < g(\varepsilon))$.
- 3) Let $\mathfrak{d}_{I, \theta, \sigma}^{\text{inc}}$ be defined similarly but $\mathcal{F}' = \{f_i : i < \sigma\}$ with the sequence $\langle f_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ being $<_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}}$ -increasing.
- 4) Let $\mathfrak{D}_{I, \theta, \sigma}$ be the set of regular $\chi > \theta$ such that there is a $\subseteq$ -increasing sequence $\langle \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle$ of subsets of ${}^\mu\theta$ such that: $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ has a $(I, < \sigma)$ -bound for $\varepsilon < \chi$ and $\bigcup \{\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\} = {}^\mu\theta$.
- 5) Let $\mathfrak{D}_{I, \theta, \sigma}^{\text{eq}} = \min\{|\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup \{{}^\iota(\mu\theta) : \iota < \sigma\} \text{ has no } (I, < \sigma)\text{-bound } g\}$ where
- 6) g is a $(I, < \sigma)$ -bound of $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup \{{}^\iota(\mu\theta) : \iota < \sigma\}$ when $g \in {}^\mu\theta$ and if $\bar{g}' = \langle g_\iota : \iota < \sigma \rangle$ and $\iota < \sigma \Rightarrow \bar{g}' \restriction \iota \in \mathcal{F}$ then for I^+ -many $\varepsilon \leq \mu$ we have $\iota < \sigma \Rightarrow g_\iota(\varepsilon) \leq g(\varepsilon)$.
- 7) If I is the ideal $\{\emptyset\}$ on μ then we may write μ instead of I omitting μ (and I) and means $\mu = \theta \wedge I = J_\theta^{\text{bd}}$.

Definition 4.18. We define $\mathfrak{d}_{I, \theta, \sigma}^{\text{eq}}$, etc. when $\leq$ is replaced by $=$.

Claim 4.19. 1) Assume $\theta > \kappa$ are regular and $\lambda = \text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \kappa}) > \theta$. If $\bar{C}$ is a (λ, κ) -ladder system then $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$ (and $\lambda > \theta$).

2) Assume $\theta > \kappa$ are regular and $\lambda = \text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \kappa}^{\text{seq}}) > \theta$. If $\bar{C}$ is a tree-like (λ, κ) -ladder system then $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$.

3) Assume $\theta > \kappa, \lambda \geq \chi$ are regular cardinals and $\chi \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta, \kappa}$. If $\text{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C}, I)$, I is θ^+ -complete, $\lambda(\bar{C}) = \lambda$ and $\kappa(\bar{C}) = \kappa$ then $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$.

4) If $\theta > \sigma$ are regular then $\text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \sigma}) > \theta \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \sigma}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta, \sigma}$ and $\text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, <\sigma}) \notin [\sigma, \theta]$ and $\text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \sigma}^{\text{inc}}) \notin \theta^+ \cap \text{Reg} \setminus \{\sigma\}$.

Remark 4.20. 1) Assume $\theta_0 = 2^{\aleph_0} = \text{cf}(2^{\aleph_0})$, $\theta_{n+1} = \mathfrak{d}_{\theta_n, \aleph_1}$. Then we can use part (3) but $\mu = \sup\{\theta_n : n < \omega\}$ is not necessarily strong limit. We can continue $\langle \theta_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ getting $\kappa(\bar{C}) = \aleph_1$. Do we get $\{\delta : \text{pp}(\sum_{i < \delta} \theta_i) = \text{cov} \dots\} \in \mathcal{D}_{\omega_1}$?

2) See [7]: $\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, <\theta} = \text{cf}(\text{NS}_\theta)$ may be $< \text{cf}(\text{NS}_\theta)$.

Proof. 1) By 4.3 we have $\text{OBB}_\lambda(\bar{C})$, by part (4), $\text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \kappa}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta, \kappa}$ and by part (3) with $\chi := \lambda$ we deduce $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$ as promised.

2) Similarly.

3) Clearly we can find $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ such that

- (*)₂ (a) $\bar{\mathcal{F}} = \langle \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \alpha \leq \chi \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing continuous
- (b) $\bar{g} = \langle g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle, g_\varepsilon \in {}^\theta\theta$
- (c) g_ε is a $(< \kappa)$ -bound of $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ for $\alpha < \lambda$
- (d) $\mathcal{F}_\chi = {}^\theta\theta$.

Let $\bar{t}$ be such that

- (*)₃ $\bar{t} = \langle t_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle \in {}^\lambda\chi$ is a witness for $\text{OBB}_\chi(\bar{C})$.

For each $i < \theta$ let:

- (*)₄ $\bar{t}_i = \langle t_\delta^i : \delta \in S \rangle \in {}^\lambda\theta$ be $t_\delta^i = g_{t_\delta}(i)$.

Let

- (*)₅ $\mathcal{U}_1 := \{i < \theta : \bar{t}_i \text{ is not a witness for } \text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})\}$.

For each $i < \theta$ let (f_i, E_i) be such that

- (*)₆ (a) $f_i : \lambda \rightarrow \theta$
- (b) $E_2 = S \bmod I$
- (c) if $i \in \mathcal{U}_1$ and $\delta \in E_i$ then $(\exists \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \geq t_\delta^i)$ that is $(\exists \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \geq g_{t_\delta}(i))$.

Let $E = \cap \{E_i : i < \theta\}$ hence $S \setminus E \in I$. For each $\alpha < \lambda$ let $h_\alpha : \theta \rightarrow \theta$ be $h_\alpha(i) = f_i(\alpha)$ and $s_\alpha = \min\{\varepsilon < \chi : h_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon\}$ so $\alpha \mapsto s_\alpha$ is a fuction from λ to θ . By the choice of $\bar{t}$ we have

$$\mathcal{W} := \{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(s_\alpha \leq t_\delta)\} \neq \emptyset \bmod I.$$

So we can choose $\delta(*) \in \mathcal{W} \cap E$. Now $\{h_\alpha : \alpha \in C_{\delta(*)}\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\delta(*)}$ hence by the choice of $g_{t_{\delta(*)}}$ we have

- (*)₇ $\mathcal{U}_2 = \{i < \theta : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(h_\alpha(i) \leq g_{t_\delta}(i)) \text{ equivalently } (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_i(\alpha) \leq t_\delta^i)\} \neq \emptyset \bmod J_\theta^{\text{bd}}$.

Now

- (*)₈ $\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2 = \emptyset$

hence

- (*)₉ $\mathcal{U}_1 \neq \theta \bmod J_\theta^{\text{bd}}$

hence

- (*)₁₀ $\mathcal{U}_1 \neq \emptyset$, i.e. some $\bar{t}_i$ witness $\text{OBB}_\theta(\bar{C})$.

This is enough.

4) We have to show that $\chi := \text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \sigma}) \in \mathfrak{D}_{\theta, \kappa}$ if $\text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \kappa}) > \theta$.

So let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\theta\theta$ be of cardinality $\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \kappa}$ such that no $g \in {}^\theta\theta$ is $(\leq \kappa)$ -bound of $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\langle \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle$ be $\subseteq$ -increasing with union $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\varepsilon < \chi \Rightarrow |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon| < |\mathcal{F}| = \mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \kappa}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^+ = \{g \in {}^\theta\theta : \text{for some } \mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ of cardinality } < \sigma \text{ and } i_* < \theta \text{ we have } i_* < i < \theta \Rightarrow g(i) = \sup\{f(i) : f \in \mathcal{F}'\}\}$.

- $\odot_1$ $\langle \mathcal{F}'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -increasing.

Now we shall prove

- $\odot_2$ $\cup\{\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^+ : \varepsilon < \chi\} = {}^\theta\theta$?

Let $h \in {}^\theta\theta$, by the choice of $\mathcal{F}$ the function h is not a $(< \sigma)$ -bound of $\mathcal{F}$ hence there is $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of cardinality $< \sigma$ witnessing it which means that for every large enough $i < \theta$, $h(i) \leq \sup\{f(i) : f \in \mathcal{F}'\}$. Let $\mathcal{F}' = \{f_j : j < j_* < \sigma\}$, let $\varepsilon_h(j) = \min\{\varepsilon : f_j \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon\}$ and let $\varepsilon_h := \sup\{\varepsilon_h(j) : j < j_*\} < \chi$ so clearly $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_h}^+$ hence $\odot_2$ is proved.

Lastly, obviously

$\odot_3 g_\varepsilon$ is a $(< \sigma)$ -bound of $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^+$.

Together we have shown that $\chi \in \mathbb{D}_{\theta, \sigma}$. Next, why $\chi = \text{cf}(\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \sigma}) \notin [\sigma, \theta]$?

Let $\langle \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle, \langle g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi \rangle$ be as above. Let $g \in {}^\theta \theta$ be a common $<_{J_\theta^{\text{bd}}}$ -upper bound of $\{g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\}$

$\boxplus g$ is a $(< \sigma)$ -bound of $\mathcal{F}$.

[Why? If $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ has cardinality $< \sigma$ then $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon < \chi$, so $\{i : (\forall f \in \mathcal{F}')(f(i) \leq g_\varepsilon(i)) \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } J\} \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } J$ but $g_\varepsilon \leq_{J_\theta^{\text{bd}}} g$, so g indeed is a $(< \sigma)$ -bound of $\mathcal{F}$.]

But $\boxplus$ contradicts the choice of $\mathcal{F}$. $\square$

Remark 4.21. 1) We may combine OBB and the results of §2 (or [26]), e.g. *see also* ??elow.

2) Like 4.19 for $\mathfrak{d}_{\theta, \sigma}^{\text{eq}}$, etc. (connection to Sep).

* * *

We look at relatives of OBB, though we shall not use them.

Other variants are

Definition 4.22. 1) $\text{OBB}_J^0(\bar{C}, I)$ is defined as in 4.1(1) but we demand only $\{\delta \in S : \delta = \sup\{\alpha \in C_\delta : f(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta\}\} \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } I$.

2) Let $\text{OBB}_J^1(\bar{C}, I)$ mean $\text{OBB}_J(\bar{C}, I)$.

3) $\text{OBB}_J^2(\bar{C}, I)$ when

- (a) J is a partial order
- (b) I is an ideal on $S = S(\bar{C})$
- (c) there is $\bar{t}$ which is a witness for $\text{OBB}_J^2(\bar{C}, I)$ which means:
 - (α) $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$
 - (β) $t_\delta \in J$
 - (γ) if $f : \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \rightarrow J$, then the set $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(t_\delta \not\leq_J f(\alpha))\}$ belongs to I^+ .

4) $\text{OBB}_J^3(\bar{C}, I)$ is defined similarly replacing (c)(γ) by

(c)(γ)' if $f : \cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\} \rightarrow S$ then the set $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(t_\delta \not\leq_J f(\alpha))\} = S(\bar{C}) \text{ mod } I$.

5) $\text{OBB}_J^4(\bar{C}, \bar{I})$ is $\text{OBB}_J^+(\bar{C}, I)$, i.e. is defined as in 4.1(1) but in the end $\{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f(\alpha) \leq_J t_\delta)\} = S \text{ mod } I$.

6) $\text{OBB}_J^5(\bar{C}, I)$ is defined, see 4.10(2).

Claim 4.23. 1) If J is linearly ordered, then $\text{OBB}_J^2(\bar{C}, I) \Rightarrow \text{OBB}_J^1(\bar{C}, I)$.

2) $\text{OBB}_J^1(\bar{C}, \bar{I}) \Rightarrow \text{OBB}_J^0(\bar{C}, \bar{I})$ and $\text{OBB}_J^1(\bar{C}, \bar{I}) \Rightarrow \text{OBB}_J^2(\bar{C}, \bar{I})$ and $\text{OBB}_J^3(\bar{C}, \bar{I}) \Rightarrow \text{OBB}_J^2(\bar{C}, \bar{I})$.

Claim 4.24. Assume that J_* is a σ -directed partial order.

1) If $J_* = J_\sigma^{\text{bd}}$, $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) > 2^\sigma$, $\sigma = \sigma^{<\kappa}$ and $\text{OBB}_\theta^3(\bar{C}, I)$, then $\text{OBB}_{J_*}^2(\bar{C}, I)$.

2) We can use any κ -directed partial order J_* of cardinality σ .

Claim 4.25. In 4.10(2), assume we are given $\langle (J^\xi, \bar{J}^\xi, \bar{g}^\xi) : \xi < \xi(*) \rangle$ such that

- (α) $J^\xi, \bar{J}^\xi = \langle J_i^\xi : i < i(\xi) \rangle, \bar{g}^\xi = \langle g_t^\xi : t \in J \rangle, \bar{C}, \kappa, I$ are as in 4.10(2) for each $\xi < \xi(*)$
- (β) $\alpha < \theta \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\xi(*)} < \theta$.

Then we can find a θ -complete ideal $I' \supseteq I$ such that for each ξ , for some $j_\xi < i(\xi)$, $\text{OBB}_{j_\xi}^3(\bar{C}, I')$ holds.

Proof: Like 4.10.

□_{4.25} ⟨j.49⟩

Observation 4.26. $\text{OBB}_{J_1}^\ell(\bar{C}, I)$ holds when

- (a) J_1, J_2 are partial orders
- (b) $\text{OBB}_{J_1}^\ell(\bar{C}, I)$
- (c) $f : J_1 \rightarrow J_2$
- (d) for every $t^* \in J_2$, for some $s^* \in J_1$, we have $(\forall s \in J_1)(h(s) <_{J_2} t^* \Rightarrow s <_{J_2} s^*)$.

Proof: Let $\bar{t} = \langle t_\delta : \delta \in S(\bar{C}) \rangle$ exemplifies $\text{OBB}_{J_1}^\ell(\bar{C}, I)$.

For each $\delta \in S(\bar{C})$ let $s_\delta \in J_1$ be such that $t_\delta \leq_J s_\delta$. It is enough to show that $\bar{s} = \langle s_\delta : \delta \in S(\bar{C}) \rangle$ exemplifies $\text{OBB}_{J_2}^\ell(\bar{C}, I)$. So assume $f_1 : \text{Dom}(\bar{C}) \rightarrow J_1$ and let us define $f_2 : \text{Dom}(\bar{C}) \rightarrow J_2$ by $f_2(\alpha)h(f_1(\alpha))$.

Let $W = \{\delta \in S : (\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)(f_2(\alpha) \leq_{J_2} t_\delta)\}$. So $\ell = 2 \Rightarrow W \in I^+$, and $\ell 3 \Rightarrow W = S(\bar{C}) \bmod I$. Hence it suffices to show that $(\forall \alpha \in C_\delta)[f_1(\alpha) \leq_{J_1} s_\delta]$, and hence it is enough to prove:

$$(\forall s \in J_1)(h(s) \leq_{J_2} t_\delta \Rightarrow h(s) \leq_{J_1} s_\delta).$$

5. CONCLUSIONS FOR THE μ -FREE TRIVIAL DUAL CONJECTURE

We shall look at the following definition.

Definition 5.1. 1) For a ring R and a cardinal μ , let $\text{sp}_\mu(R)$ be the class of regular cardinals κ such that there is a witness $(\bar{G}, h)$ which means:

- ⊗ (a) $\bar{G} = \langle G_i : i \leq \kappa + 1 \rangle$
- (b) $\bar{G}$ is an increasing continuous sequence of free left R -modules
- (c) if $i < j \leq \kappa + 1$ and $(i, j) \neq (\kappa, \kappa + 1)$, then G_j/G_i is free
- (d) h is a homomorphism from G_κ to R
- (e) h cannot be extended to a homomorphism from $G_{\kappa+1}$ to R
- (f) $|G_{\kappa+1}| \leq \mu$.

2) For a ring R and cardinals $\mu \geq \theta$, we define $\text{sp}_{\mu, \theta}(R) = \text{sp}_{\mu, \theta}^1(R)$ similarly replacing “free” by “ θ -free” in clause (c). Writing $\text{sp}_{<\mu}(R)$ or $\text{sp}_{<\mu, \theta}(R)$ means that “ $|G_{\kappa+1}| < \mu$ ” in clause (f).

Definition 5.2. 1) Let $\text{sp}(R) = \cup \{\text{sp}_\mu(R) : \mu \text{ a cardinal}\} = \{\kappa : \kappa \text{ is a regular cardinal such that for some } \bar{G} \text{ the conditions } \otimes(a) - (e) \text{ from 5.1(1) hold}\}$.

2) Let $\text{sp}_1(R) = \cap \{\text{sp}_\theta^1(R) : \theta \text{ a cardinal}\}$ where $\text{sp}_\theta^1(R) = \{\kappa : \kappa \text{ is regular such that for some } \mu, \text{ we have } \kappa \in \text{sp}_{\mu, \theta}(R)\}$.

We next define as in 5.1, but now we replace the cardinal κ by a set of ideals on κ , that is:

Definition 5.3. 1) Let $\text{sp}_{\lambda, \theta}^2(R)$ be the set of cardinals κ such that $J_\kappa^{\text{bd}} \in \text{SP}_{\lambda, \theta}(R)$ where: $\text{SP}_{\lambda, \theta}(R)$ is the set of ideals J on some κ such that for every $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$, there exists a witness $(\bar{G}, h)$ (for r) which means that $(r, \bar{G}, h)$ possess the following properties:

- ⊗ (a) $\bar{G} = \langle G_i : i \leq \kappa + 1 \rangle$ is a sequence of (left) R -modules
- (b) $G_\kappa = \oplus \{G_i : i < \kappa\} \subseteq G_{\kappa+1}$
- (c) if $u \in J$, then $G_{\kappa+1}/\oplus \{G_i : i \in u\}$ is a θ -free (left) R -module
- (d) G_i is a θ -free R -module
- (e) $|G_{\kappa+1}| \leq \lambda$
- (f) h is a non-zero homomorphism from G_κ to ${}_R R$, i.e. R as a left module
- (g) there is no homomorphism h^+ from $G_{\kappa+1}$ to ${}_R R$ such that $x \in G_\kappa \Rightarrow h^+(x) = h(x)r$.

2) Omitting θ means $\theta = \infty$; omitting also λ means for some λ ; writing “ $< \lambda$ ” has the obvious meaning.

Remark 5.4. 0) In 5.3(1), for $J = J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$, we may replace clause (c) by “ $i < \kappa \Rightarrow G_{\kappa+1}/G_i$ is a θ -free R -module”; in general, we may replace J by a directed subset of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ generating it.

1) In the present definition of $\text{SP}_{\kappa, \theta}(R)$, we need to use $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, |R|^\chi, J)$ below applying SP in 5.6. But normally it suffices to have a version of BB with fewer colours and weaker demands on $|G_i|$, for example, and even

- (A) Use $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, \chi_*, \theta, J)$ where $\chi_* = (\sup\{|R|^{\chi_i} : i < \kappa\})$, where $\chi_i = |G_i| + \sup\{|\text{Hom}(G_j, {}_R R)| : j < \kappa\}$
 - (B) We define $\text{SP}_{\lambda, \bar{\chi}, \sigma, \theta}(R)$ as in 5.3 but
 - (e)' $\bar{h} = \langle h_i : i < \sigma \rangle, h_i \in \text{Hom}(G_\kappa, {}_R R)$ and if $i < j < \sigma$, then $h_j - h_i$ cannot be extended to any $h' \in \text{Hom}(G_{\kappa+1}, {}_R R)$
 - (f)' $|G_{\kappa+1}| \leq \lambda$ and $|\text{Hom}(G_i, R)| \leq \chi_i \leq \chi$.
 - (C) In 5.6, we change
 - (b)' $\kappa \in \text{sp}_{\lambda, \chi, \sigma, \theta}$ or $(\bar{C} \text{ is tree-like, } \kappa \in \text{sp}_{\lambda, \bar{\chi}, \sigma, \theta})$ and $J \in \text{SP}_{\lambda, \bar{\chi}, \sigma, \mu}$ witnesses it)
 - (e)' $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C} \upharpoonright S_i, (\chi, \sigma), J)$.
- 2) $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C} \upharpoonright S_i, (\chi, 1/\sigma), J)$ is sufficient for the right version of 5.3, see Definition 0.2(2); really we need there to use $\theta = 2^\kappa$ and the guessing in an initial segment of the possibilities, i.e. in 5.3 we need: without loss of generality $|G_i| \leq \kappa$ for every i , given $f_\varepsilon \in \text{Hom}(\oplus\{G_i, i < \kappa\}, \mathbb{Z})$ for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) < 2^\kappa$ we can find, e.g. a permutation π of κ , inducing $G_\kappa^\pi \supseteq \oplus\{G_i : i < \kappa\}$ such that none of them can be extended to $f \in \text{Hom}(G_\kappa^\pi, \mathbb{Z})$ or use: there is $g' \in \text{Hom}(\bigoplus_{i < \kappa} G_i, R)$ or $G_i \cong \mathbb{Z}$ or
- $\lambda_i = 2^{\mu_i} = \lambda_i^{<\lambda_i} \gg \aleph_0$.
- 3) We may use only tree-like $\bar{C}$'s (in 5.6(c)) in $\text{sp}_{\lambda, \bar{\chi}, \sigma, \mu}$ (in 5.6(b)) and in $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C} \upharpoonright S_i, (\bar{\chi}, \sigma), J)$.
- 4) In the proof of 5.6, if we demand $G_i (i < \kappa)$ is free, then we can save on χ , using free G_α^* 's.
- 5) We can use “very few colours” as in [23, Ap, §1], i.e., 0.4(1A).

As in 0.1

Definition 5.5. Let $\text{TDU}_{\lambda, \mu}(R)$ mean that R is a ring and there is a μ -free left R -module G of cardinality λ with $\text{Hom}_R(G, R) = \{0\}$, that is, with no non-zero homomorphism from G to R as left R -modules.

Claim 5.6. A sufficient condition for $\text{TDU}_{\lambda, \mu}(R)$ is:

- ⊗ (a) R is a ring with unit ($1 = 1_R$)
- (b) $J \in \text{SP}_{\chi, \theta}(R)$ is an ideal on κ
- (c) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is such that $\text{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$ and $C_\delta \subseteq \delta$ where S is a set of ordinals with no last member
- (d) λ is regular, or at least $\text{cf}(\lambda) > |R| + \chi$ and $\mu > \kappa$
- (e) $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, \beth_2(|R| + \chi), J)$ and $\chi \leq \lambda$, so $I_* = J_S^{\text{bd}}$ recalling $J_S^{\text{bd}} = \{\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{U} \subseteq S \text{ and } \sup(\mathcal{U}) < \sup(S)\}$
- (f) $\bar{C}$ is (μ, J) -free; recalling 1.3(1A); and $\mu \geq \theta$.

Remark 5.7. 1) See Remark 5.10 and ⊗₀ in §0, needing fewer colours, even as in 0.4(1A).

2) The beginning of the proof can be stated separately.

Proof. By the definition of $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, \beth_2(|R| + \chi), J)$, there is a sequence $\langle S_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ of λ pairwise disjoint subsets of $S = S(\bar{C})$ such that $\text{BB}^-(\lambda, \bar{C} \upharpoonright S_\varepsilon, \beth_2(|R| + \chi), J)$ for each $\varepsilon < \lambda$.

Without loss of generality $\alpha \in S \Rightarrow C_\delta \cap S = \emptyset$ and without loss of generality S is a set of limit ordinals and each C_δ is a set of successor ordinals and let $C_* =$

$\cup\{C_\delta : \delta \in S\}$. We say that a D is $\bar{C}$ -closed when $D \subseteq C_* \cup S$ and $\delta \in D \cap S \Rightarrow C_\delta \subseteq D$. So for every $B' \subseteq C_* \cup S$ there is a $\bar{C}$ -closed $B'' \subseteq C_* \cup S$ such that $B' \subseteq B'' \wedge |B''| \leq |B'| + \kappa$. We can put λ of the sets S_i 's together, i.e.

$\boxplus_1$ we can replace $\langle S_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ by $\langle \cup\{S_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in \mathcal{U}_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda\} \rangle$ if $\langle \mathcal{U}_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda \rangle$ is a partition of λ .

Also

$\boxplus_2$ we can replace $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ by $\langle C_\delta \setminus h(\delta) : \delta \in S \rangle$ when $\delta \in S \Rightarrow h(\delta) \in C_\delta$,

hence without loss of generality

$\boxplus_3$ (a) $\varepsilon < \lambda \wedge S' \subseteq S_\varepsilon \wedge |S'| < \lambda \Rightarrow \text{BB}^-(\lambda, \bar{C} \upharpoonright (S_\varepsilon \setminus S'), \beth_2(|R| + \chi), J)$
 (b) if $u \subset \lambda$ has cardinality $< \lambda$ then for λ ordinals $\varepsilon < \lambda$ we have $\delta \in S_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \sup(u) < \min(C_\delta)$.

Without loss of generality

$\otimes_0 \chi \geq |R|$.

[Why? Replace χ by $\chi + |R|$ just check the demand on χ .]

$\otimes_1$ there is a μ -free R -module G_* of cardinality $\chi_* := (2^\chi)^+$ such that
 (a) $G_* = \oplus\{G_{*,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \chi_*\}$
 (b) if G is a μ -free R -module of cardinality $\leq \chi$, then G is isomorphic to $G_{*,\varepsilon}$ for χ_* ordinals $\varepsilon < \chi_*$ (we need just $G_\iota^r, \iota \leq \kappa + 1$ from Definition 5.3)
 (c) $G_{*,\varepsilon}$ has cardinality $\leq \chi$ for each $\varepsilon < \chi_*$.

[Why? Because the number of such G up to isomorphism is $\leq 2^{|R|+\chi} = 2^\chi$.]

Let $E = \{(\varepsilon, \zeta) : \varepsilon, \zeta < \chi_* \text{ and } G_{*,\varepsilon} \cong G_{*,\zeta}\}$, so E is an equivalence relation on χ_* and $\varepsilon/E := \{\zeta < \chi_* : \varepsilon E \zeta\}$ is the equivalence class of $\varepsilon < \chi_*$ under E . For $\varepsilon < \chi_*$, let f_ε^1 be an isomorphism from $G_{*,\min(\varepsilon/E)}$ onto $G_{*,\varepsilon}$.

$\otimes_2$ for any $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ let $\mathbf{x}_r = \{(\bar{G}, h) : (\bar{G}, h) \text{ witness } J \in \text{SP}_{\chi,\theta}(R) \text{ for } c, \text{ see Definition 5.3}\}$
 $\otimes_3 H_* := \oplus\{G_\alpha^* : \alpha \in C_*\} \oplus \bigoplus\{K_\delta^* : \delta \in S\}$, where
 • each G_α^* is isomorphic to G_* under g_α^1
 • K_δ^* isomorphic to G_* for $\delta \in S$ under g_δ^2 and
 • for $\varepsilon < \chi_*$ let $G_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = g_\alpha^1(G_{*,\varepsilon})$, $K_{\delta,\varepsilon}^* = g_\alpha^2(G_{*,\varepsilon})$
 $\otimes_4$ let $K_{<\delta} = \oplus\{G_\alpha^* : \alpha \in C_\delta\}$ for $\delta \in S$
 $\otimes_5$ for every $B \subseteq C_* \cup S$ and $\delta \in S$
 • let $H_B := \oplus\{G_\alpha^* : \alpha \in D \cap C_*\} \oplus \bigoplus\{K_\delta^* : \delta \in S \cap B\}$
 • let $H_{<\delta} = \oplus\{G_\alpha^* : \alpha \in C_*\} \cup \{G_\gamma^* : \gamma \in S \cap \delta\}$.

Easily

$\otimes_6$ for every $x \in H_*$ there is a $\bar{C}$ -closed set $D_x^* \subseteq C_*$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$ such that $x \in G_{D_x^*}$, in fact there is a minimal one.

Let

$\otimes_7$ (a) $\langle (x_i, r_i) : i < \lambda \rangle$ list the pairs (x, r) such that $x \in H_*, r \in R$

(b) by $\otimes_6 + \boxplus_3$ without loss of generality $\delta \in S_i \Rightarrow \sup(D_{x_i}^*) < \min(C_\delta)$

$$\otimes_8 H_{<\alpha} := \oplus \{G_\beta^*, K_\delta^* : \beta < \alpha \text{ and } \delta \in S \cap \alpha\}.$$

For $\iota < \kappa$ let $f_{\delta,\iota}^1$ be an isomorphism from G_* onto $G_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^*$ where $\beta(\delta,\iota)$ is the ι th member of C_δ .

For $\delta \in S$, clearly $\text{Hom}(K_{<\delta}, {}_R R)$ is a set of cardinality $\leq 2^{(2^\chi)^+}$. Also any $f \in \text{Hom}(K_{<\delta}, {}_R R)$ is determined by $\langle f \upharpoonright G_\alpha^* : \alpha \in C_\delta \rangle$. Hence by clause (e) of the assumption, for each $i < \lambda$, we can find $\langle h_\delta^1 : \delta \in S_i \rangle$ such that

- $\otimes_9$ (a) if $\delta \in S$, then $h_\delta^1 \in \text{Hom}(K_{<\delta}, {}_R R)$ stationarily
- (b) if $h \in \text{Hom}(H_*, {}_R R)$, then for some (can get many)
 $\delta \in S_i$, we have $h_\delta^1 \subseteq h$

$\otimes_{10}$ for $\delta \in S_i$, let

- (a) $x_\delta^* = x_i, r_\delta^* = r_i$
- (b) let $\bar{G}^\varepsilon = \langle G_\iota^\delta : \iota \leq \kappa \rangle$ and h_δ^* be, for r_δ^* , as guaranteed in Definition 5.3, so $h_\delta^* \in \text{Hom}(G_{\kappa}^\varepsilon, {}_R R)$
- (c) for $\iota < \kappa$, let $\varepsilon(\delta, \iota) = \text{Min}\{\varepsilon < \chi_* : G_{*,\varepsilon} \cong G_i^\delta\}$ and let $f_{\delta,i}^0$ be an isomorphism from G_i^δ onto $G_{*,\varepsilon(\delta,i)}$.

[Why possible? By clause (b) of the assumption.]

Now

- $\otimes_{11}$ for $\delta \in S_i$ and $\iota < \kappa$ we can choose $\varepsilon_{\delta,\iota,1} < \varepsilon_{\delta,\iota,2} < \chi_*$ from $Y = \{\varepsilon < \chi_* : G_{*,\varepsilon(\delta,\iota)}^\delta \cong G_\iota^\delta\}$ such that $h_\delta^1 \circ g_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^1 \circ f_{\varepsilon_{\delta,\iota,1}}^1 = h_\delta^1 \circ g_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^1 \circ f_{\varepsilon_{\delta,\iota,2}}^1$.

[Why? Note that

- $h_\delta^1 \in \text{Hom}(K_{<\delta}, {}_R R)$ hence $h_\delta^1 \upharpoonright G_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^* \in \text{Hom}(G_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^*, {}_R R)$
- $g_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^1$ is an isomorphism from G_* onto $G_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^*$ hence $h_\delta^1 \circ g_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^1 \in \text{Hom}(G_*, {}_R R)$
- f_ε^1 is an isomorphism from G_* , $\min(y)$ onto $G_{*,\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon \in Y$
- $\langle h_\delta^1 \circ g_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^1 \circ f_\varepsilon^1 : \varepsilon \in y \rangle$ is a sequence of members of $\text{Hom}(G_{*,\min(y)}, {}_R R)$
- $\text{Hom}(G_*, {}_R R)$ has cardinality $\leq |\text{Hom}(G_{*,\varepsilon(\delta,i)}, {}_R R)| \leq 2^\chi$, whereas $|Y| = \chi_* = (2^\chi)^+$.]

Let $\mathbf{g}_{\delta,\iota}^2$ be the following embedding of G_ι^δ into H_* , in fact, into $G_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^*$:

$$\mathbf{g}_{\delta,\iota}^2(x) = \mathbf{g}_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^1 \circ f_{\varepsilon_{\delta,\iota,2}}^1(x) - \mathbf{g}_{\beta(\delta,\iota)}^1 \circ f_{\varepsilon_{\delta,\iota,1}}^1(x).$$

Let $\mathbf{g}_\delta^3$ be the embedding of G_κ^δ into H_* extending $\mathbf{g}_{\delta,\iota}^2$ for each $\iota < \kappa$, so

- $(*)_1$ (a) $\mathbf{g}_\delta^3$ is an embedding
- (b) $h_\delta^1 \upharpoonright \text{Rang}(\mathbf{g}_\delta^3)$ is zero.

Let $\mathbf{g}_\delta^4$ be the following homomorphism from G_κ^δ into H_*

$$(*)_2 \quad \mathbf{g}_\delta^4(x) = \mathbf{g}_\delta^3(x) + h_\delta^*(x)x_\delta^* \text{ for } x \in G_\kappa^\delta.$$

[Why? Recalling $h_\delta^*(x) \in R$ hence $h_\delta^*(x)x_\delta^* \in H_*$ indeed.]

By the choice of $H_{<\delta}$ as $\delta \in S_i \Rightarrow x_\delta^* = x_i^* \in H_{D_{x_i}^*} \subseteq H_{\min(C_\delta)}$ clearly

- $(*)_3$ $\mathbf{g}_\delta^4$ is an embedding of G_κ^δ into $H_{<\delta}$.

So

- $(*)_4$ if h is a homomorphism from H where $K_{<\delta} \subseteq H \subseteq H_{<\delta}$ into ${}_R R$ such that $h_\delta^1 \subseteq h \wedge h(x_\delta^*) = r_\delta^*$, then: $x \in G_\kappa^\delta \Rightarrow h(\mathbf{g}_\delta^4(x)) = h_\delta^*(x)r_\delta^*$.

Let $\alpha_{\delta,\kappa} < \chi_*$ be such that $G_{*,\alpha_{\delta,\kappa}} \cong G_{\kappa+1}^\delta$, and let $f_{\delta,\kappa}^0$ be an isomorphism from $G_{\kappa+1}^\delta$ onto $G_{*,\alpha_{\delta,\kappa}}$, so $\mathbf{g}_\delta^1 \circ f_{\delta,\kappa}^0$ embeds $G_{\kappa+1}^\delta$ into H_* hence $\mathbf{g}_\delta^1 \circ f_{\delta,\kappa}^0 - \mathbf{g}_\delta^4$ is a homomorphism from $G_{\kappa+1}^\delta$ into H_* (actually an embedding). Let

$$L_\delta = \{\mathbf{g}_\delta^1 \circ f_{\delta,\kappa}^0(x) - \mathbf{g}_\delta^4(x) : x \in G_\kappa^\delta\}.$$

Clearly L_δ is an R -submodule of H_* . Now by the choice of $(\bar{G}^\delta, r_\delta^*)$

- (*)₅ there is no homomorphism h from H_* into ${}_R R$ such that $h_\delta^1 \subseteq h$ and $h(x_\delta^*) = r_\delta^*$ and $h \upharpoonright L_\delta = 0_{L_\delta}$.

Lastly,

- (*)₆ (a) $L := \Sigma\{L_\delta : \delta \in S'\}$, a sub-module of H_*
 (b) $H = H_*/L$.

So

- (*)₇ $\text{Hom}(H, {}_R R) = 0$.

[Why? Assume $h \in \text{Hom}(H, {}_R R) \neq 0$, so we can define $h^+ \in \text{Hom}(H_*, {}_R R)$ by $h^+(x) = h(x + L)$. Let $x \in H_*$ be such that $h^+(x) \neq 0$, so for some $i < \lambda$ we have $(x_i, r_i) = (x, h^+(x))$. By the choice of $\langle h_\delta^1 : \delta \in S_i \rangle$ the set $\{\delta \in S'_\alpha : h \upharpoonright K_\delta = h_\delta^1\}$ is unbounded in λ , so for some $\delta \in S_i$ we have $h \upharpoonright K_\delta = h_\delta^1$, and by the choices of $\varepsilon_{\delta,\iota,1}, \varepsilon_{\delta,\iota,2}, \alpha_{\delta,\kappa}$ we are done as $h^+ \upharpoonright L_\delta$ is zero.]

- (*)₈ H is θ -free.

[Why? As the case $\mu \leq \kappa$ is easier we shall ignore it. Let $H^1 \subseteq H$ be of cardinality $< \mu$. So for some $H^2 \subseteq H_*$ of cardinality $< \mu$, we have $H^1 = \{x + L : x \in H^2\}$. So for some $u \subseteq \lambda$ of cardinality $< \mu$, we have $H^2 \subseteq \langle \cup\{g_\alpha^1(G_*) : \alpha \in u \cap S\} \cup \cup\{g_\delta^2(G_*) : \delta \in S \cap u\} \rangle_{H_*}$. Without loss of generality, $\delta \in u \Rightarrow C_\delta \subseteq u$, as $|C_\delta| = \kappa < \mu$. Let $H^3 := \Sigma\{f_\alpha^1(G_*) : \alpha \in u\} + \Sigma\{f_\delta^2(G_*) : \delta \in u \cap S\}$.

So $H' \subseteq (H^3 + L)/L$, and hence it is enough to prove that $H^3 + L/L$ is free. The rest should be clear.] □_{5.6}

Claim 5.8. 1) In 5.6 if $\theta = \infty$ and $\mu = \lambda$, (i.e., for $\bar{C}$ the cardinality and amount of freeness coincide) we can deduce also $\lambda \in \text{sp}_\lambda(R)$.

2) In 5.6, it suffices to assume

- ⊗⁺ as in ⊗ of 5.6 omitting (d) and strengthening clause (b) to
 (b)⁺ $\kappa \in \text{sp}_{\leq \lambda, \mu}(R)$, moreover $J \in \text{SP}_{\leq \lambda, \mu}(R)$ is an ideal on κ .

⟨5e.21⟩

Proof: This should be clear. □_{5.8}

Claim 5.9. 1) For $R = \mathbb{Z}$, we have

- (a) $J_{\aleph_0}^{\text{bd}}$ belongs to $\text{sp}_{\aleph_0}(R)$
 (b) $J_{\aleph_1}^{\text{bd}}$ belongs to $\text{sp}_{\aleph_1}(R)$
 (c) $J_{\aleph_1 * \aleph_0}^{\text{bd}}$ belongs to $\text{sp}_{\aleph_1}(R)$
 (d) if $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$ then $J_{\aleph_2}^{\text{bd}}$ belongs to $\text{sp}_{\aleph_2}(R)$
 (e) if $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$ then $J_{\aleph_2 * \aleph_1}^{\text{bd}}$ belongs to $\text{sp}_{\aleph_2}(R)$.

2) Similarly for R a proper subring of $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$.

Remark 5.10. 1) If we like the proof of TDU_μ to be more direct, we have to add $\text{Hom}(G_{\kappa+1}/G_\kappa) = 0$, otherwise we have to “iterate”.

2) Claim 5.9 not novel but have no direct quote. Clauses (b),(c) is essentially by [12] and clauses (d),(e) are the parallel for $\aleph_1$; we can continue (e.g. for higher $\aleph_i$'s inductively).

3) This is close to “ G is derived from $\mathcal{F}$ ”, see 1.11.

Proof of 5.9: For part (1) let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a prime, $a_n = a$ (or can use, e.g. $a_n = n!$), for part (2) let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a prime such that $\frac{1}{a} \notin R$ and $a_n = a$; but could use any $\langle a_n : n < \omega \rangle$ such that $a_n R \subset R$.

Clause (a):

Let $G_{\omega+1}$ be the abelian group generated by $\{x_n, y_n : n < \omega\}$ freely except that

$$a_n y_{n+1} = y_n + x_n.$$

Let $G_n = \oplus \{\mathbb{Z}x_k : k < n\}$ and $G_\omega = \cup \{G_n : n < \omega\}$.

Letting $a_{<n} = \prod_{\ell < n} a_\ell$ so $a_0 = 1$, we have $G_{\omega+1} \models a_{<(n+1)} y_{n+1} = y_0 + \sum_{\ell \leq n} a_{<\ell} x_\ell$.

We now choose $h \in \text{Hom}(G_\omega, \mathbb{Z})$ by choosing $h(x_n)$ by induction on n such that: if $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ then for some n , computing in $\mathbb{Q}$, the sum $b + \sum_{\ell \leq n} a_{<\ell} h(x_\ell)$ is not in R .

Clause (b): Let $\eta_\alpha \in {}^\omega 2$ for $\alpha < \omega_1$ be pairwise distinct. Let G_{ω_1+1} be the abelian group freely generated by $\{x_i : i < \omega_1\} \cup \{y_\eta : \eta \in {}^{>2}\omega\} \cup \{z_{\alpha,n} : \alpha < \omega_1, n < \omega\}$ freely except for the equations

$$a_n z_{\alpha,n+1} = z_{\alpha,n} + y_{\eta_\alpha \upharpoonright n} + x_{\omega_\alpha + n}.$$

For $\alpha \leq \omega_1$ let $G_\alpha := \oplus \{\mathbb{Z}x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \subseteq G_{\omega_1+1}$.

Clause (c): As in clause (b) but for $A \in J$ we let $G_A = \bigoplus \{Rx_{\omega_\alpha + n} : (\alpha, n) \in A\}$.

Clause (d):

Let $\Lambda = \{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ be a sequence pairwise distinct numbers of ${}^\omega 2$. Let $\langle \rho_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ be a sequence of pairwise disjoint members of ${}^\omega 2$.

Let $\langle \varrho_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ be a sequence of pairwise distinct members of ${}^\omega 2$ for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, can be the same. Let $\langle \nu_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2 \rangle$ be a sequence of members of ${}^{(\omega_1)}(\omega_2)$ such that increasing sequence of length ω_1 of non-zero ordinals $< \aleph_1$ such that for every $\alpha < \beta < \omega$ for some $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ we have $\{\eta_\alpha(\zeta) : \zeta \in [\varepsilon, \omega_1)\} \cap \{\eta_\beta(\zeta) : \zeta \in (\varepsilon, \omega_1)\} = \emptyset$.

Let G_{ω_2+1} be the Abelian group generated by

$$X = \{z_{\alpha,\varepsilon,n} : \alpha < \aleph_2, \varepsilon < \aleph_1, n < \aleph_0\} \cup \{y_\zeta : \zeta < \aleph_1\} \cup \{x_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \alpha < \aleph_2, \varepsilon < \aleph_1\} \cup \{t_\alpha : \alpha < \aleph_2\}$$

freely except the equations for $\alpha < \aleph_2, \alpha < \aleph_1, n < \aleph_0$

$$\bigoplus_{\alpha,\varepsilon,n}^1 a_n z_{\alpha,\varepsilon,n+1} = z_{\alpha,\varepsilon,n} + y_{\nu_\alpha(\omega_\varepsilon + n)} + x_{\alpha,\varrho_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \upharpoonright n} + t_{\omega_1 \alpha + \omega_\varepsilon + n}.$$

For $\alpha \leq \aleph_2$ let $G_\alpha = \bigoplus \{\mathbb{Z}t_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$.

$\bigoplus_2 G_{\omega_2+1}/G_{\omega_1}$ is $\aleph_2$ -free.

Why? Let $H_* = \oplus \{\mathbb{Z}y_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \aleph_2\}$ and for $\alpha < \aleph_2$, H_α be the subgroup of G_{ω_2+1} generated by $G_{\omega_2} \cup H_* \cup \{z_{\alpha,\varepsilon,n} : \varepsilon < \aleph_1, n < \aleph_0\}$.

Let $H_{<\alpha} = \Sigma\{H_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ clearly $G_{\omega_2+1} = H_{<\omega_2}$. Hence it suffices to prove for $\alpha < \aleph_2$

$$\boxplus_\alpha^3 H_{<\alpha}/G_{\omega_2} \text{ is free.}$$

Why? Without loss of generality $\alpha \geq \aleph_1$ let $\langle \beta(\xi) : \xi < \aleph_1 \rangle$ list $\{\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ with no repetitions. Easily we can find a sequence $\zeta = \langle \zeta_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ such that the set $\mathcal{U}_\beta := \{\nu_\beta(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon \in [\zeta_\beta, \aleph_1)\}$ for $\beta < \alpha$ are pairwise disjoint. Without loss of generality $\omega^\omega | \zeta$ divide ζ_β and let $\mathcal{U} = \aleph_2 \setminus \cup \{\mathcal{U}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$, moreover, without loss of generality $\xi_1 < \xi_2 \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(\nu_{\beta(\xi_1)}) \cap \{\nu_{\beta(\xi_2)}(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon \in [\zeta_{\beta(\xi_1)}, \aleph_2)\} = \emptyset$.

For $\xi \leq \aleph_1$ let $H_{\alpha,\xi}$ be the subgroup of $H_{<\alpha}$ generated by $G_{\omega_2} \cup \{y_\gamma : \gamma \in \mathcal{U}\} \cup \{y_{\nu_\gamma(\varepsilon)} : \varepsilon \in [\zeta_\gamma, \aleph_1) \text{ for some } \gamma < \xi_1\} \cup \{\beta(\zeta) : \zeta < \xi\} \cup \{x_{\gamma,\varrho} : \gamma \in \{\beta(\zeta) : \zeta < \xi\} \text{ and } \varrho \in \omega^{>2}\}$. So $H_{\alpha,0} = G_{\omega_2}$ and $H_{\alpha,\omega_1} = H_{<\alpha}$ and $\langle H_{\alpha,\xi} : \xi \leq \aleph_1 \rangle$ is increasing continuous. Hence it suffices to prove, for each $\xi < \aleph_1$, that $H_{\alpha,\xi+1}/H_{\alpha,\xi}$ is free. Let $H'_{\alpha,\xi}$ be the subgroup of $H_{\alpha,\xi+1}$ generated by $H_{\alpha,\xi} \cup \{x_{\beta(\xi),\varrho} : \varrho \in \omega^{>2}\}$. Now $H_{\alpha,\xi} \subseteq H'_{\alpha,\xi} \subseteq H_{\alpha,\xi+1}$. Easily $H'_{\alpha,\xi}/H_{\alpha,\xi}$ is countable and free.

Also $H_{\alpha,\xi+1}/H'_{\alpha,\xi}$ is free $\{z_{\beta(\xi),\varepsilon,n} : \varepsilon \in [\zeta_\beta, \aleph_1), n < \omega\}$ is a free basis. Together $\boxplus_2^3$ holds

$$\boxplus_4 \text{ for some } h_0 \in \text{Hom}(G_{\omega_1}, \mathbb{Z}) \text{ has no extension } h_2 \in \text{Hom}(G_{\omega_1+1}, \mathbb{Z}).$$

For $\alpha < \aleph_2$ let $X_\alpha = \{t_{\omega_1\alpha+\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \aleph_1\}$ and $Y_\alpha = \{g_{\nu_\alpha(\varepsilon)} : \varepsilon < \aleph_1\}$ and $K_\alpha^1 = \oplus \{\mathbb{Z} : t \in X_\alpha\} \subseteq G_{\omega_1} + K_\alpha^2 = \oplus \{\mathbb{Z}_y : y \in Y_\alpha\} \oplus K'_\alpha \subseteq G_{\omega_2+1}$ and K_α^3 the subgroup of $G_{|\text{omega}_2+1}$ generated by $\{z_{\alpha,n} : \varepsilon < \omega_1, n < \omega\} \cup K^2_\alpha$ so $K_\alpha^1 \subseteq K_\alpha^2 \subseteq K_\alpha^3 \subseteq G_{\omega_2+1}$. Let $L_\alpha^\ell = \text{Hom}(K_\alpha^\ell, \mathbb{Z})$ for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$.

Let $L = \{f \upharpoonright L_\alpha^2 : f \in L_\alpha^3\}$ so we know that $|L| > 1 \Leftrightarrow \text{Ent}(K_\alpha^3/K_\alpha^2, \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$ in fact are isomorphic. As in the proof of clause (b), $|L_\alpha| = 2^{\aleph_1}$. Let $u_\alpha = u(\alpha) = \text{Rang}(\nu_\alpha)$. We now define a function $\mathbf{F}_\alpha : {}^{u(\alpha)}\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow L$ as follows: for $f \in {}^{(u_\alpha)}\mathbb{Z}$ let

$g_f \in \text{Hom}(K_\alpha^2, \mathbb{Z})$ be defined by $g_f(y_{\nu_\alpha(\varepsilon)}) = f(\nu_\alpha(\varepsilon))$, $g_f(t_{\omega_1\alpha+\varepsilon}) = 0$ and then $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(f) = g_f + L_\alpha^2 \in L_\alpha$

(*)_{4.2} it suffices to find $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \aleph_2 \rangle$ such that $g_\alpha \in L_\alpha$ and for every $f : {}^{\omega_1}\mathbb{Z}$ for some $\alpha < \aleph_2$ we have $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(f \upharpoonright u_\alpha) \neq g_\alpha$.

[Why is (*)_{4.2} enough? Let $f_\alpha \in {}^{u(\alpha)}\mathbb{Z}$ be such that $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(f_\alpha) = g_\alpha$. We define h_0 by:

$$h_0(t_{\omega_1\alpha+\varepsilon}) = f_\alpha(\nu_\alpha(\varepsilon)).$$

Check.

Why is (*)_{4.2} enough?

Case 1: $2^{\aleph_1} = 2^{\aleph_2}$

We could have made:

$$\odot \cup \{u_\alpha : \alpha < \aleph_2\} = \omega_1.$$

We note that $\{\langle \mathbf{F}_\alpha(f \upharpoonright u_\alpha) : \alpha < \aleph_2 \rangle : f \in {}^{(\omega_1)}\mathbb{Z}\}$ is a subset of $\prod_{\alpha < \omega_2} L_\alpha$ but the former has cardinality $\leq 2^{\aleph_1}$ and the later has cardinality $2^{\aleph_1}$ so we can find $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha < \aleph_2 \rangle \in \prod_{\alpha < \omega_2} L_\alpha$ which is $\neq \langle \mathbf{F}_\alpha(f \upharpoonright u_\alpha) : \alpha < \aleph_2 \rangle$ for every $f \in {}^{(\omega_1)}\mathbb{Z}$.

Case 2: $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$

Let $\mathbf{h}$ be a one-to-one function from ${}^{\omega_1}2$. Let $\varrho_\alpha^* \in {}^{\omega_1}2$ for $\alpha < \aleph_2$ be pairwise distinct and demand

$$\odot \quad \nu_\alpha(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{h}(\varrho_\alpha^*).$$

We choose h_0 such that for some h_*

- (*) (a) $h_* : {}^{\omega_1}2 \rightarrow {}^\omega\mathbb{Z}$
- (b) $\langle h_*(t_{\omega_1\alpha+\omega\varepsilon+n}) : n < \omega \rangle = h_*(\nu_\alpha \upharpoonright (\omega\varepsilon + \omega))$
- (c) if $\delta < \aleph_1$ is a limit ordinal, $\nu \in {}^\delta 2, \nu \triangleleft \nu_\ell \in {}^{\omega+\omega}2$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\nu_1 \neq \nu_2$ then $h_*(\nu_1) \neq h_*(\nu_2)$.

Now suppose $h_2 \in \text{Hom}(G_{\omega_2+1}, \mathbb{Z})$ extend h_0 , and define the two-place relation E on $\aleph_2 : \alpha E \beta$ iff $(\forall \varrho \in {}^{>\omega}2)(h_2(x_{\alpha,\varrho}) = h_2(x_{\beta,\varrho}))$. As $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$ there are $\alpha < \beta < \aleph_2$ such that $\alpha E \beta$. So there is a limit ordinal $\delta < \aleph_1$ such that $\varrho_\alpha^* \upharpoonright \delta = \varrho_\beta^* \upharpoonright \delta$, but $\varrho_\alpha^* \upharpoonright (\delta + \omega) \neq \varrho_\beta^* \upharpoonright (\delta + \omega)$.

The rest should be clear.

Clause (e):

As in clause (d) but for $A \in J_{\aleph_2 * \aleph_1}^{\text{bd}}$ we let $G_A = \oplus \{Rt_{\omega_1\alpha+\varepsilon} : (\alpha, \varepsilon) \in A\}$.

□_{5.9} (5e.28)

Conclusion 5.11. 1) TDU_μ holds, when $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu, 2^{(2^{\aleph_1})^+}, J)$, where $J \in \{J_{\aleph_0}^{\text{bd}}, J_{\aleph_1 \times \aleph_0}^{\text{bd}}\}$ and λ has uncountable cofinality.

2) Similarly $\text{BB}(\lambda, \mu, \langle 2^{\text{Dom}(J)}, 2^{\text{Dom}(J)} \rangle, J)$.

3) Similarly for $\text{TDU}_{\lambda, \mu}$.

Proof of 5.11: 1) By 5.6.

2) By 5.15.

3) Similarly.

□_{5.11} (5e.32)

Remark 5.12. 1) The number, $2^{(2^{\aleph_1})^+}$, of colours is an artifact of the proof. Actually 2 and even fewer colours (as in [23, Ap, §1], 0.4(1A)) should suffice.

2) See 1.9. But we can quote in §0 BB with 2 instead of $\beth_2(|R| + \chi)$.

Conclusion 5.13. If CH then $\text{TDU}_{\aleph_{\omega+1}}$.

1) If $\theta > \sigma > \aleph_0$ are regular and $\theta, \sigma \in \text{sp}(R)$ then $\theta^{+\theta+1} \in \text{sp}(R)$.

2) If $\theta > \aleph_1$ belongs to $\text{sp}(\mathbb{Z})$ then $\theta^{+\theta+1} \in \text{sp}(R)$.

Proof. Proof of 0.6

1) By §3 there is a μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\mu$ of cardinality μ^+ , hence by $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, \lambda, *)$ by 2.10. By 5.6, 5.9 there is G as required.

Similarly for iterations.

2) Similarly.

□

Proof. The proof is divided to two cases, clearly together they suffice.

Case 1: For some $\mu \in \mathbb{C}_{\aleph_2}$ and χ such that $\chi < 2^\mu$ we have $\chi^{\aleph_1} = \chi$.

Let $J = J_{\aleph_2}^{\text{bd}}$ hence $\text{pp}(\mu) = {}^+ 2^\mu$.

By conclusion 3.8 we have $\text{BB}(2^\mu, \mu^+, \chi, J)$. By clause (d) of claim 5.9 we have $J \in \text{sp}_{\aleph_1}(\mathbb{Z})$ hence by claim 5.6 we have $\text{TDU}_{2^\mu, \mu^+}(\mathbb{Z})$, more than required.

Case 2: $\mu_i \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_2}, \mu_i < \mu_j$ and $(\forall \chi < 2^{\mu_i})(\chi^{\aleph_1} < 2^{\mu_i})$ for $i < \omega_1$ and $i < j \Rightarrow \mu_1 < \mu_j$.

For some limit $\delta < \omega_1$ we have $\Sigma\{\mu_i : i < \delta\} \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$, so without loss of generality $\mu := \Sigma\{\mu_n : n < \omega\} \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$ and let $\lambda_n = \text{cf}(2^{\mu_n})$ and without loss of generality $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\pi\lambda_n, <_{J_{\omega}^{\text{bd}}})$ is well defined. So by 4.12 we have, for $\kappa < \mu$, $\text{BB}(\lambda, \aleph_{\omega+1}, \chi, J_{\aleph_1 \times \aleph_0})$. By clause (c) of 5.9 we have $J_{\aleph_1 * \aleph_0} \in \text{sp}_{\aleph_1}(\mathbb{Z})$ hence by clause 5.6 we have $\text{TDU}_{\lambda, \aleph_{\omega+1}}(\mathbb{Z})$ as required. $\square_{5.13}$

We can get more than in 5.6.

Definition 5.14. 1) For cardinals λ, θ, σ , let $\text{SP}_{\lambda, \theta, \sigma}^3(R)$ be the set of ideals J on some κ such that for every $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ some pair $(\bar{G}, \bar{h})$ witness it for r which means:

- ⊕ (a) $\bar{G} = \langle G_i : i < \kappa + 1 + \sigma \rangle$ is a sequence of R -modules each of cardinality $\leq \lambda$
- (b) $G_\kappa = \oplus \{G_i : i < \kappa\}$ and $\zeta < \sigma \Rightarrow G_\kappa \oplus_R R \subseteq G_{\kappa+1+\zeta}$
- (c) if $u \in J$ and $\zeta < \sigma$, then $G_{\kappa+1+\zeta} / \oplus \{G_i : i \in u\}$ is a θ -free left R -module
- (d) each G_i is a θ -free left R -module
- (e) $\bar{h} = \langle h_\zeta : \zeta < \sigma \rangle$ and h_ζ is a homomorphism from G_κ to ${}_R R$ for $\zeta < \sigma$
- (f) for each $\varepsilon < \sigma$ or at most one $\zeta < \sigma$, there is a homomorphism h^+ from $G_{\kappa, 1+\zeta}$ to the left R -ideal ${}_R R$ extending h_ε and mapping 1_R to r .

Claim 5.15. A sufficient condition for $\text{TDU}_{\lambda, \mu}(R)$ (i.e., there is a μ -free left R -module G of cardinality λ with $\text{Hom}_R(G, R) = \{0\}$ with no non-zero homomorphism from G to R as left R -modules) is:

- ⊗ (a) R is a ring with unit ($1 = 1_R$)
- (b) $J \in \text{SP}_{\chi, \theta, \sigma}(R)$ is an ideal on κ
- (c) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is such that $\text{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa$ and $C_\delta \subseteq \delta$
- (d) λ is regular or at least $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \chi$ and $\mu > \kappa$
- (e) $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}, \langle 2^{|R|+\chi}, \sigma \rangle, \kappa)$
- (f) $\bar{C}$ is (μ, J) -free (but see 1.9).

Proof: Similar like the proof of 5.6 with some changes. First of all, instead of $\otimes_1$ we use

- $\otimes'_0$ let $(\bar{G}^r, \bar{h}^r)$ witness Definition 5.14 for $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$
- $\otimes'_1$ G_* is a μ -free R -module G_* of cardinality $\leq \chi$ and for some ordinal $\varepsilon(*) \leq |R| + \kappa$
 - (a) $G_* = \bigoplus \{G_{*, \varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)\}$
 - (b) if $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$, then for some $2^{|R|+\chi}$ ordinals $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)$ and sequence $\bar{G}^r$ as in 5.14 we have $j < \kappa \Rightarrow G_j^r \cong_{f_{r,j}^*} G_{*, \varepsilon}$ hence
 - (c) $|G_*| \leq \chi + \kappa + |R|$.

Secondly, after $\otimes_8$ we choose $\langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S_i'' \rangle$ such that $\eta_\delta \in {}^\kappa \varepsilon(*)$ and $j < \kappa \Rightarrow G_{*, \eta_\delta(j)} \cong G_j^{r_i}$.

Thirdly, we choose $\langle \zeta_\delta^*, \delta \in S_i \rangle$ such that

- $\otimes'_{9.1}$ (a) if $\delta \in S$, then $\zeta_\delta^1 < \sigma$
 (b) if $h \in \text{Hom}(H_*, {}_R R)$, then for unboundedly many $\delta \in S_i$ we have: $\zeta_\delta^1 \neq \bar{c}_\delta^r(h \upharpoonright \bigcup_{\alpha \in C_\delta} G_\alpha^*)$ - see below
- $\otimes_{9.2}$ for $\delta \in S_i$ and $h \in \text{Hom}(K_{<\delta}, {}_R R)$, we define $\mathbf{c}_\delta^1(h)$ to be the minimal $\zeta < \sigma$ satisfying $\oplus_\zeta$ below and zero if there is no such ζ
- $\oplus_{\delta, \zeta}^i$ there is $f \in \text{Hom}(G_{\kappa_{n+1}+\zeta}^{r_i}, {}_R R)$ such that
- (α) $f(x) = r_i$
 - (β) if $j < \kappa$, then $x \in G_j^{r_i} \Rightarrow f(x) = h(g(f_{r_i, j}^*(x)))$.

The rest is similar.

$\square_{5.15}$ $\langle 5e.43 \rangle$

Conclusion 5.16. Assume that $J_{\kappa_n \times \omega}^{\text{bd}} \in \text{sp}_{\lambda_n, \theta_n}(R)$ and $\kappa_n < \kappa_{n+1}$ for $n < \omega$. Then for some λ , for every large enough n , $\text{TDU}_{\lambda, \theta_n^{+\omega+1}}$ holds.

Proof: We shall use 5.6 freely.

Let $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$ be greater than λ_n for each n , and let $\sigma_n < \mu$ be large enough.

Case 1: There is $\lambda' < 2^\mu < 2^{\lambda'}$.

Then we can apply 2.7.

Case 2: 2^μ is singular or just there is a μ^+ -free $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega \mu$ of cardinality 2^λ .

By 2.10(2).

Case 3: Neither Case 1 nor Case 2.

By Theorem 1.22 $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{m < \omega} \lambda_m, <_{J_\omega^{\text{bd}}})$ for some $\lambda_m < \mu$ increasing with n and let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ exemplify this. Let $S_{\text{gd}} = S_{\bar{f}}^{\text{gd}}$ - see [21, II] or here ?? and $S'_{\text{gd}} = \{\delta \in S_{\text{gd}} : \text{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_0 \text{ and } \delta \text{ is divisible by } \mu\}$.

For each $n < \omega$, $\delta \in S_* = S'_{\text{gd}} \cap S_{\kappa_n}^\lambda$, let $C_{\delta, n}$ be a club of δ of order type κ_n and let

$$C_\delta^n = \{\mu^\alpha + \eta_\delta(n) : \alpha \in C_\delta \text{ and } n < \omega\}$$

So $\text{otp}(C_\delta^n) = \kappa$, $C_\delta^n \subseteq \delta \sup(C_\delta^n)$, but $\bar{C} := \langle C_\delta^+ : \delta \in S_* \rangle$ is an S_* -club system. By 2.13 we know that $\bar{C}^n$ is $(\kappa_n^{+\kappa_n}, J_{\kappa_n \times \omega}^\kappa)$ -free (see Definition 1.8(2) and 1.3). Now for [27, 3.1] one checks that for every n large enough, we have $\text{BB}(\lambda, \bar{C}^n, (\lambda, \theta_*)^n, \kappa_n)$, where $\theta_* < \mu$ was large enough.

$\square_{5.16}$ $\langle 5e.47 \rangle$

Conclusion 5.17. If the ideal $J = J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}$ belongs to $\text{SP}_{\lambda, \mu}(R)$ then TDU_μ holds.

Proof: Left to the reader.

$\square_{5.17}$ $\langle 5e.53 \rangle$

Remark 5.18. Now we can check all the promises from §0.

REFERENCES

- [1] James Cummings and Saharon Shelah. Cardinal invariants above the continuum. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 75:251–268, 1995. math.LO/9509228. [CuSh:541]
- [2] Mirna Džamonja and Saharon Shelah. On squares, outside guessing of clubs and $I_{<f}[\lambda]$. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 148:165–198, 1995. math.LO/9510216. [DjSh:562]
- [3] Paul C. Eklof and Alan Mekler. *Almost free modules: Set theoretic methods*, volume 65 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 2002. Revised Edition.
- [4] Rüdiger Göbel and Jan Trlifaj. *Approximations and endomorphism algebras of modules*, volume 41 of *de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2006.
- [5] Ruediger Goebel and Saharon Shelah. $\aleph_n$ -free modules with trivial dual. *Results in Mathematics*, 54:53–64, 2009. [GbSh:920]
- [6] Menachem Magidor and Saharon Shelah. When does almost free imply free? (For groups, transversal etc.). *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 7(4):769–830, 1994. [MgSh:204]
- [7] Pierre Matet, Andrzej Rosłanowski, and Saharon Shelah. Cofinality of the nonstationary ideal. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 357:4813–4837, 2005. math.LO/0210087. [MRSh:799]
- [8] Saharon Shelah. Black Boxes. . 0812.0656. 0812.0656. 0812.0656. [Sh:309]
- [9] Saharon Shelah. *Non-structure theory*, volume accepted. Oxford University Press. [Sh:e]
- [10] Saharon Shelah. *Non-structure in λ^{++} using instances of WGCH*. 0808.3020. [Sh:838]
- [11] Saharon Shelah. Polish Algebras, shy from freedom. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, accepted. math.LO/0212250. [Sh:771]
- [12] Saharon Shelah. Whitehead groups may not be free, even assuming CH. II. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 35:257–285, 1980. [Sh:98]
- [13] Saharon Shelah. Classification theory for nonelementary classes, I. The number of uncountable models of $\psi \in L_{\omega_1, \omega}$. Part A. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 46:212–240, 1983. [Sh:87a]
- [14] Saharon Shelah. Classification theory for nonelementary classes, I. The number of uncountable models of $\psi \in L_{\omega_1, \omega}$. Part B. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 46:241–273, 1983. [Sh:87b]
- [15] Saharon Shelah. Models with second order properties. IV. A general method and eliminating diamonds. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 25:183–212, 1983. [Sh:107]
- [16] Saharon Shelah. More on stationary coding. In *Around classification theory of models*, volume 1182 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 224–246. Springer, Berlin, 1986. [Sh:247]
- [17] Saharon Shelah. Classification of nonelementary classes. II. Abstract elementary classes. In *Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985)*, volume 1292 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 419–497. Springer, Berlin, 1987. Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T. [Sh:88]
- [18] Saharon Shelah. Uncountable groups have many nonconjugate subgroups. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 36:153–206, 1987. [Sh:192]
- [19] Saharon Shelah. Reflecting stationary sets and successors of singular cardinals. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 31:25–53, 1991. [Sh:351]
- [20] Saharon Shelah. Advances in Cardinal Arithmetic. In *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, pages 355–383. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. N.W. Sauer et al (eds.). 0708.1979. [Sh:420]
- [21] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994. [Sh:g]
- [22] Saharon Shelah. σ -entangled linear orders and narrowness of products of Boolean algebras. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 153:199–275, 1997. math.LO/9609216. [Sh:462]
- [23] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998. [Sh:f]
- [24] Saharon Shelah. Applications of PCF theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 65:1624–1674, 2000. [Sh:589]
- [25] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 116:285–321, 2000. math.LO/9809200. [Sh:460]
- [26] Saharon Shelah. Middle Diamond. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 44:527–560, 2005. math.LO/0212249. [Sh:775]

- [27] Saharon Shelah. More on the Revised GCH and the Black Box. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 140:133–160, 2006. math.LO/0406482. [**Sh:829**]
- [28] Saharon Shelah. $\aleph_n$ -free abelian group with no non-zero homomorphism to $\mathbb{Z}$. *CUBO, A Mathematical Journal*, 9:59–79, 2007. math.LO/0609634. [**Sh:883**]
- [29] Saharon Shelah. *Classification Theory for Abstract Elementary Classes*, volume 18 of *Studies in Logic: Mathematical logic and foundations*. College Publications, 2009. [**Sh:h**]
- [30] Saharon Shelah. Diamonds. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 138:2151–2161, 2010. 0711.3030. [**Sh:922**]

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM EINSTEIN INSTITUTE
OF MATHEMATICS, EDMOND J. SAFRA CAMPUS, GIVAT RAM, JERUSALEM 91904, ISRAEL, AND:
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS HILL CENTER-BUSCH CAMPUS, RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY
OF NEW JERSEY 110 FRELINGHUYSEN ROAD, PISCATAWAY, NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08854, USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://www.math.rutgers.edu/~shelah`